

H.R. 229. A bill to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide that Federal building shall be designated and constructed to maximize fallout protection and that non-Federal construction financed in whole or in part with Federal funds may be designated to maximize fallout protection; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 230. A bill to provide Federal assistance for programs of research and experimentation in crime prevention and detection, and for the training of law enforcement personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 231. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 232. A bill to eliminate discriminatory exemptions on the Bank Holding Company Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 233. A bill to establish active duty medical and dental officer strengths in the Air Force to achieve comparable opportunities in all services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 234. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations of certain lands when beneficial to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 235. A bill to exclude in national cemeteries the burial of persons convicted of treason and similar crimes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 236. A bill to assure adequate grave sites for overseas wartime veterans in Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 237. A bill to establish the U.S. Agency for World Peace within the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 238. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States for that portion of the construction cost of certain schools which is attributable to Negroes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 239. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the John F. Kennedy Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 240. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct a special educational training and physical rehabilitation program for persons with educational or physical deficiencies to enable them to serve effectively in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 241. A bill to provide assistance to individuals with low incomes by reducing the amount of income tax on individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 242. A bill to facilitate the procurement of physicians and dentists for the Armed Forces by establishing scholarships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 243. A bill to amend section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to equalize the retired pay of certain officers of the uniformed services retired prior to June 1, 1958, under the same law and with the same service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 244. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide deductions for persons engaged in trade or business who provide new jobs for the skilled and for all persons who provide new jobs for domestics and the unskilled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 245. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 246. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow or parent, or the marriage of a child, shall not prevent the payment of benefits if the marriage is annulled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 247. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 248. A bill to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide for shelter in Federal structures, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 249. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prohibit the award of contracts by the United States to certain persons; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 250. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 251. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the Office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 252. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Institute to be a graduate school for advanced studies in American government for selected individuals of outstanding ability to pursue advanced studies in American political theory, methods, and institutions in preparation for public service with the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 253. A bill to permit the release of certain veterans from liability to the United States arising out of loans made, guaranteed, or insured under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 254. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 255. A bill to provide for special programs for workers 45 years of age or older; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 256. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to provide for programs of job training and education of inmates of correctional institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 257. A bill to amend certain provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to landlords and tenants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 258. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research, study and surveys, documentation, and description of the natural environmental systems of the United States for the purpose of understanding and evaluating the condition of these systems and to provide information to those concerned with natural resources management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 259. A bill to amend section 661 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide that the punishment for larceny of livestock shall be the same as the punishment for larceny of property of a value exceeding \$100; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 260. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the discontinuance or change of certain operations or services of common carriers by rail, in order to require the Interstate Commerce

Commission to give full consideration to all financial assistance available before permitting any such discontinuance or change; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 261. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 262. A bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 263. A bill to incorporate the Association of American Law Schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 264. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of the monthly benefits payable thereunder, to raise the wage base, to provide for cost-of-living increases in such benefits, to increase the amount of the benefits payable to widows, to provide for contributions to the social security trust funds from the general revenues, to otherwise extend and improve the insurance system established by such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 265. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 266. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 267. A bill to designate the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore as the Paul H. Douglas National Lakeshore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a gift to an educational institution to be deducted as a charitable contribution even though it is made to provide a scholarship for a specified individual, so long as such individual is not a relative of the donor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 269. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to review the report on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in Louisiana and Texas to determine whether certain modifications should be made in that project; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 270. A bill to provide coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act for employment in an excluded category which follows employment subject to the act without a break in service of 30 days or less, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 271. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 272. A bill to extend the period during which amounts transferred from the employment security administration account in the unemployment trust fund to State accounts may be used by the States for payment of expenses of administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 273. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 274. A bill to grant an additional income tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 275. A bill to amend section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit retired employees to elect use of either sub-

legislation to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

274. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 3739. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollutions, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 3740. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 3741. A bill for the education and training of the handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 3742. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3743. A bill to provide for the addition of certain property in Philadelphia, Pa., to Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 3744. A bill to establish a national cemetery in New England; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3745. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 3746. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3747. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain insurance agents shall be treated as outside salesmen for purposes of computing adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3748. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, by equalizing taxation with a special exemption for farm marketing and purchasing agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3749. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, with respect to the taxation of banks, savings and loan associations, and other institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3750. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the proceeds of life insurance contracts transferred for a valuable consideration to certain persons shall not be subject to income taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3751. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the

treatment of certain redemptions of preferred stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 3752. A bill to provide that the United States shall make no payments or contributions to the United Nations for furnishing assistance to Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3753. A bill to consolidate water quality management and pollution control authorities and functions in the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3754. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the income limitations applicable with respect to the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 3755. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., to Miami, Fla., with an extension to Homestead, Fla.; and that the highway running from Miami, Fla., to Key West, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3756. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3757. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to require corroboration of unsupported statements and evidence of eligibility for aid or assistance thereunder which may be provided by applicants for such aid or assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3758. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 3759. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 3760. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3761. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for more effective prevention, control, and abatement of air pollution through the establishment of air regions and standards applicable thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3762. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3763. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 3764. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize certain grants for rehabilitation of the lakes of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 3765. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3766. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to make widows

of servicemen who die on active duty in the Armed Forces eligible for educational assistance under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3767. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 3768. A bill to prohibit age discrimination in employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3769. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3770. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 3771. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 3772. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the statutory rates for anatomical loss or loss of use and for arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3773. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may furnish a therapeutic or rehabilitative device, as well as other medical equipment and supplies without first establishing eligibility to receive an invalid lift; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 3774. A bill to reduce thefts of motor vehicles by prohibiting the exportation of unidentified motor vehicles, and by prohibiting the unauthorized possession and transmission in interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 3775. A bill to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the State of Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3776. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3777. A bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3778. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to give 6 months' advance public notice of the planned closing or relocation of a veterans' facility, and to provide for at least one veterans' service center in each State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 3779. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3780. A bill to establish and maintain orderly marketing conditions for processing pears in the interest of producers and consumers, and an orderly flow of the supply thereof to market throughout its normal marketing season to avoid unreasonable

disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 4455. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 4456. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4457. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent, across-the-board benefit increase, and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 4458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that for estate and gift tax purposes the value of stock in an open-end investment company shall be its redemption price; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 4459. A bill to postpone the application of daylight saving provisions of the Uniform Time Act of 1956 in certain States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 4460. A bill for the relief of the living descendants of the Creek Nation of 1814; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for State and local income taxes paid by an individual during the taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4462. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to assist in providing means for portability of credits under certain private pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 4463. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 4464. A bill for the relief of the living descendants of the Creek Nation of 1814; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4465. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 4466. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 4467. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States, beginning July 1, 1969, to disregard specified earnings of persons receiving aid to families with dependent children, as an incentive to such persons to find and continue in gainful employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4468. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strikes at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4469. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that the existing prohibition against payment of an annuity to an individual who continues to work for his last nonrailroad employer shall not apply in the case of a spouse's annuity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4470. A bill to amend section 610 of

title 33, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4471. A bill to extend the period within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4472. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide more equitable tariff treatment for parts of ball bearings with integral shafts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4473. A bill to establish in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration an Inspector of Programs and Operations; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4474. A bill to require the expenditure of 35 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship repair yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4475. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the Buy American Act, to require the construction, alteration, and repair of U.S. naval vessels in shipyards in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 4476. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4477. A bill to permit the transmission in the mails of lottery tickets and other matter mailed in a State where lotteries are legal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt State-conducted lotteries from the taxes on wagering; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 4479. A bill to provide a system for the return of Federal income tax revenues to the States to be used exclusively for law enforcement purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 4480. A bill to coordinate and consolidate the major civilian marine and atmospheric functions of the Federal Government through the establishment of a Department of Marine and Atmospheric Affairs, to enunciate national policies pertinent to the marine and atmospheric interests of the United States, to further the expanded exploration of marine environs and the use of marine resources, to encourage research and development in the marine and atmospheric sciences and technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4481. A bill to promote the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4482. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 4483. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 4484. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4485. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4486. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to amend certain labeling provisions of the food, drug, and cosmetic chapters to assure adequate information for consumers, including cautionary labeling of articles where needed to prevent accidental injury; prohibit worthless ingredients in special dietary foods; require new therapeutic devices to be shown safe and efficacious before they are marketed commercially; require all antibiotics to be certified; provide for the certification of certain other drugs; require records and reports bearing on drug safety; limit the distribution of sample drugs; require cosmetics to be shown safe before they are marketed commercially; clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority; make additional provisions of the act applicable to carriers; provide for administrative subpoenas; provide for strengthening and facilitating mutual cooperation and assistance, including training of personnel, in the administration of that act and of related State and local laws; prohibit the use of carcinogenic color additives in animal feeds; safeguard the health of children by banning sweetened or flavored aspirin from commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 4487. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 4488. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 4489. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4490. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4491. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for a dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 4492. A bill to authorize and direct the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Wasatch National Forest in the State of Utah by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 4493. A bill to transfer certain administrative responsibility for the operation of Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport from the Secretary of Transportation to a Washington Airports Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 4494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 4495. A bill to provide for the prototype construction of a commercial supersonic transport airplane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 880. A bill for the relief of Miloye M. Sokitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 881. A bill for the relief of Eugene M. Edward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERCY (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 882. A bill to provide for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK):

S. 883. A bill to permit a compact or agreement between the several States, for the uniform treatment of certain matters related to taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 884. A bill to authorize the appropriation of the receipts of the Colorado River development fund for the purpose of making allowances to the Hoover Dam powerplant for deficiencies in firm energy generation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 885. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer a deduction from gross income for water assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 886. A bill to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Natural Resources and to transfer certain agencies to and from such Department; to the Committee on Government Operations. (See the remarks of Mr. MOSS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

(NOTE.—The above bill was ordered to be held at the desk until February 21, 1967, for additional cosponsors.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 887. A bill to prevent Federal regulatory agencies from directly or indirectly denying regulated industries the right to exercise business judgment in selecting their method of depreciation or to account for depreciation on a deferred tax accounting basis; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to astronauts who lose their lives in line of duty in the U.S. space program; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

(NOTE.—The above joint resolution was ordered to be held at the desk until February 16, 1967, for additional cosponsors.)

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Colorado River Basin project.

I come from a dry land. In the next 25 years the population of California will double, reaching 40 million, and our present and planned supplies of water will be exhausted. In a simple world, California's water planners could, perhaps, concentrate on solving California

problems, ignoring the plight of its sister States.

But rain clouds do not stop at State boundaries; rivers and streams are no respecters of imaginary geographic lines; and drought transcends man-made political subdivisions to reach out and endanger vast regions.

Those of us in the Colorado River Basin face a water crisis of unimaginable magnitude in just three decades, and narrow sectional efforts to solve only the problems of one's own State will leave the entire basin parched and crippled by the beginning of the next century.

Those of us who represent the States of the Colorado River Basin must work together to meet our shortages, for the impact of these shortages will not fall upon individual States but upon the entire region, and, indeed, indirectly upon the entire Nation.

In the last Congress I introduced S. 1019, a bill to authorize the Lower Colorado River Basin plan. The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs conducted extensive hearings on a companion measure, H.R. 4671, which was eventually reported favorably by that committee. When the water history of the West is written, H.R. 4671 will be remembered as a major landmark. Representatives of the seven Colorado River Basin States argued, negotiated, compromised, and finally agreed upon an approach, embodied in that bill, which sought to benefit the entire West.

Today I have introduced a bill which incorporates all of the essential elements of H.R. 4671, and which I hope will provide the basis for a new round of regional discussions out of which we might finally find assurance of adequate water for the generations which will follow us.

Before deciding to introduce this bill, I discussed its content, and the need for regional cooperation, with my colleagues in the House of Representatives. I consulted Congressman ASPINALL, of Colorado, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Congressman JOHNSON of California, chairman of that committee's Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation; and Congressman HOSMER, of California, ranking minority member of that subcommittee. Although they had already introduced bills which differ in some minor respects from mine, we are all in complete agreement on the crucial aspects of this legislation. With that unanimity as a solid base, I believe we can pass Colorado River legislation in this Congress.

What is the sine qua non of regional understanding? It is an appreciation of the fact that the entire Colorado River Basin is water short. We do not have enough water in the river basin to support the existing, much less the predicted, population and economy.

Recognizing that shortage, the danger of sectionalism becomes apparent. If the central Arizona project is built without provisions to augment the water supply in the river, Arizona must fight upper basin development tooth and nail to assure that the upper basin's portion of the scarce waters flow to the lower basin unused.

Building the central Arizona project

without adequate protection for existing uses in California, Arizona, and Nevada will, in years of scarcity—which are the rule, rather than the exception—merely take water off the table in Los Angeles to put it on the table in Phoenix, and dry up the fertile farms of California's Coachella Valley so that Tucson might thrive.

Building the central Arizona project without a lower basin development fund to finance augmentation of the river's flow is a death sentence to economic growth in the lower basin, for, if the upper basin is allowed to use its water, the rich farmlands of the central Arizona project area will literally dry up and blow away for lack of water within 50 or 60 years.

I favor construction of the central Arizona project and have included it in my bill, but it should only be built as a part of a comprehensive plan for regional development.

If we should at any point waiver from the path of basinwide cooperation and be tempted to put our narrow sectional interest above the needs of the region, or of the Nation, then we should be reminded of the words of Secretary Udall:

The other point, however, that I want to stress because I want to make a record here today for the benefit of the Congressmen from the Northwest and for everyone concerned, is one of the things that we take great satisfaction in, that we have achieved in the last year, that is to bring Arizona and California together. I think this department, and whoever is Secretary in the future, must work to bring the Northwest and the Southwest and the States of the Colorado River Basin together on a common plan. If a Secretary or a Commissioner becomes a champion of one region, I think this is the way to insure failure of any plan. I think you have to have an approach whereby you look at what is best for both regions and you tailor your planning accordingly. Unless you approach it in that fashion I think you are headed for disaster and controversy.

Mr. President, the Colorado River Board of California was advised of my intention to introduce this legislation by telegram on January 31, 1967, and responded the next day with its endorsement of my proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the exchange of telegrams be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1967.

RAYMOND RUMMONDS,
Chairman, Colorado River Board of California, Los Angeles, Calif.:

After consultation with Chairman Aspinall of House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Chairman Johnson of that Committee's Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, Congressman Hosmer, ranking minority member of that Subcommittee, and Northcutt Ely, Counsel for the Colorado River Board and Special Assistant Attorney General, I have determined to introduce a Colorado River bill in the Senate soon.

I am delighted that Chairman Aspinall and Subcommittee Chairman Johnson have introduced identical Colorado River bills, H.R. 3300 and H.R. 744 respectively. Their bills include, and my new bill will include, the same language protecting 4.4 million acres of existing uses in California. All of us would authorize construction of the Central Arizona Project, subject to that priority until works to import 2.5 million acre feet

S. 879

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of section 6409(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "may pay compensation not to exceed 80 cents a pound for letters, post cards and postal cards, and 8 cents a pound for other articles" and inserting in lieu thereof "may be compensated at rates fixed by the Postmaster General".

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this body has heard again and again of the need to protect our natural resources. From my experience I have found that everyone agrees on this goal, but we are constantly frustrated in our efforts to do much about it. Notwithstanding the work of our resource agencies, notwithstanding the millions and millions of dollars appropriated by Congress, and regardless of our many conservation bills, America is suffering a progressive deterioration of natural resources.

The trouble is that we have allowed competing interests for the use of our limited resources to block any overall development and protection plan. Every resource management agency is surrounded by competing agencies, each striving to utilize our waters, minerals, and land for its own particular clientele. The result has been that we often have no policy at all when important decisions affecting our natural resources are made.

This has resulted in a loss—not for the competing interests—but for the American people. The decision to dam a river or cut down a 2,000-year-old tree is irrevocable. We will not be given the chance to make that decision again.

The choices we will make in the coming years will affect the beauty and the utility of our land for uncounted generations hereafter. The planning that we must do in the field of water resources will determine the economic future of the Nation. The planning of our land resources is hardly less important, and is so interrelated with water planning as to be inseparable. We cannot wait.

Time is running out on this once virgin land. The lush Potomac Valley is drained by a river of mud, sewage, and floating debris. The remains of unreconstructed strip mines scar the Midwest. The unique redwoods are disappearing at an increasing rate. Many of our richest minerals are becoming scarce. The lifeblood of the West, water, is often put to less than its maximum use. A hodgepodge of dams, planned or licensed by competing agencies, often bears no relation to the maximum utilization of the stream for power, recreation, and conservation. Our two biggest cities, New York and Los Angeles, are covered by vast, noxious clouds of smog. Even Phoenix and Salt Lake City are increasingly covered by a filthy haze.

Our cities are in desperate need of recreation space. People are traveling hundreds of miles to escape the noise and concrete of the city. Attendance at our national parks continues to break records. The once empty forests of Yo-

semitic National Park are now filled with so many people on some weekends that every campsite is filled. And the smoke from their numerous campfires creates a layer of smog over this beautiful park.

The President has said:

This continent is an abundance, continually being discovered and developed. But much of its richness lies hidden or unused.

I agree completely. Vast amounts of oil shale lie unused in Colorado and Utah. We still have not opened up our geothermal steam springs. The planning of water resources to meet our industrial and mining needs has not been adequate. The exploration for minerals has sometimes suffered from governmental policies. We have not had the kind of planning that would determine the benefits we will receive from different uses of the land and water.

A whole new resource field awaits development in the oceans. But we must have the planning necessary to prevent the mistakes of haphazard exploitation from being repeated in the development of the oceans.

Under present circumstances, the situation promises to get worse, not better. Population increase and technology, geared to ever-rising living standards, are exerting massive pressures on our limited supplies of resources. Water, land, and air are threatened by malpractice and the seemingly insatiable appetite of modern industrial society.

Resources for the future has projected a tripling of requirements for both energy and metals by the year 2000. We will almost double our demand for farm products and nearly triple demand for timber. Withdrawal depletions of fresh water will almost double. Increased demand for land space for outdoor recreation, suburban growth, highways, and airports will encroach on the diminishing supply. Land requirements, if each use is counted separately, would add up to 50 million more acres than this country has—and this assumes no increase in forest lands.

Forest products are projected to grow at a rate that will force us to find 300 million more acres of forest land by the year 2000. But a quarter of our annual supply is now lost to insects, diseases, and fires.

People are often unaware of the demands of an urban society on natural resources. While about 1 gallon of water a day will meet an individual's physiological requirements, the average American city dweller is using 110 gallons a day. Per capita use of water for all purposes has increased in the last 60 years from 530 to 1,900 gallons a day.

The greatest increase in the use of water in the future will come from industry. The effect this could have on pollution is foreboding.

A research foundation reported this past year that we may reach the end of big game hunting and sport fishing by the end of this century. According to this report, there will be too few streams that can support fish and too little wild land to produce forage for big game. Coupled with the increase in population, the end of one of our greatest natural resources is foreseen by this group.

While resources are limited, the uses are interrelated. The decisions on forest use intimately affect the fish and wildlife. The decisions for mineral use in an area inevitably affect its use for conservation or recreation. The true costs of industry must include the pollution and scenic destruction caused thereby. A decision on the feasibility of land and water use for industry must reflect this cost. But a multitude of different agencies prevents this interrelated planning.

The efforts of those seeking to overcome our resource problems are often frustrated by a bureaucratic maze. Newsweek magazine in 1965 said the big obstacle to restoring the Hudson River Valley is bureaucracy. It related how more than 15 Federal agencies from the Coast Guard to the Department of Commerce must deal with New York State Departments of Conservation, Health, Public Works, Commission for Fish and Game, Parks, Water Resources, Motor Boats—and the list does not end there.

This multitude of different agencies on both the State and Federal level, at best, operate in splendid isolation, pursuing contradictory policies and objectives. At worst they engage in open warfare.

One is not surprised to learn that the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture pays a bounty to North Dakota farmers for draining pot-holes and wetlands, while the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife in the Department of the Interior entreats their conservation.

More appalling is the result of conflicting policies in the Florida everglades. Here the National Park Service has come into headlong conflict with the Army Corps of Engineers. The Engineers have built massive levees to contain runoff from Lake Okeechobee and constructed 1,400 miles of drainage canals in the name of flood control. Park Service officials complain bitterly that the Engineers have drained Everglades National Park almost dry in their efforts to halt wetlands flooding and reclaim glade country for agriculture.

Flood control advocates have said that reclamation is for people and Everglades Park is "for the birds." But that is not the question at all. The real question is how to develop coordinated planning to develop priorities among limited resources.

The shocking fact is that these conflicting policies are just not being coordinated. Sufficient evaluations are not being made as to the best use of the land, and policy decisions from the separate departments are often in conflict.

We cannot let this anarchy continue without paying a high cost in irreplaceable resources. I do not feel this morass results from lack of devotion or from inefficiency in the agencies concerned. It stems from the lack of overall direction and central administration of our natural resource fields. More urgently than ever, a unified national policy is required to prevent heedless exploitation and to husband diminishing supplies.

I propose a Department of Natural Resources. I do not pretend that it will be a panacea for all of the problems I have mentioned. But it will eliminate

the lack of policy and coordination in the field. And it will be a symbol of the importance we attach to the resources we cannot replace.

WATER

Perhaps our water problems best illustrate the need for a Department of Natural Resources. The first Hoover Commission reported on this need as follows:

Incomparably the greatest opportunity for economy lies in the imposition of precautions to eliminate wasteful water development and to assure the soundness of projects finally adopted. In the past, projects have been carried through which should never have been undertaken at all. Others have been wastefully constructed and without regard to important potential uses.

Probably their most important conclusion was that developing the entire river basin is difficult, if not impossible, as long as independent bureaus with traditional loyalties and jealous clientele carve up the development and management tasks.

This Nation faces a twofold task in developing overall river basin planning. First this country must find, and find quickly, greatly increased supplies of clean water. Second, we must manage with far more wisdom than we have used thus far, the water supplies we now have.

Total management of water resources involves a variety of functions. Among others are watershed protection and management, flood control, river and harbor improvements, irrigation, fish and wildlife, recreation, desalination, and pollution. This whole package must be tied together. We must plan for entire river basins from their sources to their mouths.

Even should authorities be successfully established for every river basin, however, the basins are interrelated. Precipitation, pollution, and water use in one basin can vitally affect others. Coordination in their development and management is essential.

Interbasin transfer cannot even be considered without both river basin planning and overall planning of water programs of many basins and States. Ideally, we should have a national long-range plan for management of water resources in the United States. The national plan would then be the starting point for the river basin plans.

In trying to effectuate this planning we now have three primary departments, Defense, Agriculture, and Interior. In addition, the Federal Power Commission, which grants licenses for projects, and Health, Education, and Welfare, which determines water quality standards, must be considered in all planning.

Below the departmental level, a Pandora's box opens. In Interior alone we have this array of agencies: The Bureau of Reclamation, three power marketing agencies, Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Fish and Wildlife, the Bureau of Mines, Geological Survey, the National Park Service, the Office of Saline Water, the Office of Water Resources Research, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

On the basis of expenditures, the most extensive Federal activity in the water

resources field is conducted by the Department of Defense through the Corps of Engineers. They first were given the job of maintaining navigable waterways, which has some connection with national defense—at least a better connection than the Navy has in operating petroleum reserves. But the Corps of Engineers has advanced far past maintaining the navigability of our streams. It has gradually been expanded to include dam construction for flood control, water supply, and recreation.

The corps is a highly efficient construction organization, but there is at least an element of truth in the contention that it has been more interested in dam building than in river basin development.

The Engineers operate in every State. Though commanded by a few Army officers, the work force is composed of civilians. Since it has such a tenuous connection with the main duties of the Army it is virtually autonomous.

Until 1936, the bureaucratic tangle, while confused, at least was limited. Up to that time authority to harness rivers for storage and electric power was a function of the Bureau of Reclamation. But the jurisdiction for the Bureau was and is limited to the Western States. Following the great floods of 1936, President Roosevelt asked the Corps of Engineers to build flood control projects. At the same time, TVA was beginning the development of the Tennessee River Basin. Shortly after, Agriculture was given authority to construct small upstream and tributary check dams, and another agency entered the water picture.

In 1944, legislation logically provided that water projects should be multipurpose whenever possible. This brought the Army into irrigation, power generation, and recreation. But since the corps has no marketing facilities, the Interior Department had to market the water and power from these dams. We still face the difficult task of deciding which parts of the costs are for flood control—payable out of tax moneys—and which parts are to be paid from the sale of power.

Congress recognized the dangers in this situation when it passed the Water Resources Planning Act. This act creates a Water Resources Council to coordinate our water resources planning. But this instrument will be an awkward one at best. The Secretary of the Army whose time presumably is occupied by Vietnam, and the Secretary of HEW, who should be concerned about our cities, are now asked to plan our natural resource development.

It is clear that the basic work will be done by the staff, but the decisions must be made by the Council. The Council cannot and will not devote sufficient time to this. One Secretary could do it and accept the responsibility of those decisions.

I support the Water Resources Planning Act, but it is a stopgap measure, and the gap between our needs and our planning for those needs is getting wider.

The confusion extends into other areas. The Department of Defense now

serves more recreation seekers than the Department of the Interior. So does the Forest Service. But the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is in the Interior Department.

LAND

Although the problems are not as severe, the agencies dealing with land should also be coordinated. At present, we have the Bureau of Land Management in Interior administering part of our public lands while most of the remainder is administered by the Forest Service in Agriculture. To be effective, a Department of Natural Resources must include the Forest Service. Originally the Forest Service was supposed to administer land while the Bureau of Land Management was supposed to liquidate the Government's holdings. Now both manage land for multiple use, and their jurisdictions constantly overlap each other, as well as the jurisdictions of the National Park Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other Federal agencies.

An example of this type of duplication is the Flaming Gorge Recreation Area which straddles the Utah-Wyoming border. Much of the land surrounding the water is national forest, so the Forest Service administers part of the recreation area. But the land above the Gorge stretching into Wyoming is administered by the National Park Service. An invisible border ends their separate jurisdictions. Both Services have adapted to the situation, but this dual administration is nonsense.

Senator McGEE and I have introduced legislation which designates the Forest Service as the administrator of the entire recreation area, but this situation is symptomatic of the overlapping jurisdictions in the conservation and recreation fields.

Some people have criticized me for attempting to end the semi-independent status of the Forest Service. I feel it is far more important to insure that the expertise and solid professional background of the Forest Service personnel influence the course of resource planning that will take place in a Department of Natural Resources.

OCEAN

I would foresee in the proposed Department of Natural Resources an Assistant Secretary of Oceanography. This important official could coordinate and emphasize our efforts on this new frontier of the resource field.

Senators MUSKIE, MAGNUSON, BARTLETT, and others have called our attention to the inadequate national effort concerning our marine program. Senator MUSKIE pointed out the need for the improvement of our merchant marine fleet, the exploration of the Continental Shelf and the enhancement of our fisheries products. In addition we need a review of our interests in the law of the sea and a study of possible import restrictions on those nations practicing poor conservation techniques in our adjacent waters.

Our natural resources program cannot continue in the future without recognizing the rich resources of the oceans and determining the extent to which we can

utilize these resources to supplement those on the land.

The need for a national oceanography program has been well demonstrated. The only question that remains is whether or not it should be put in the same department as our other natural resources. I think it fits. The problems of pollution in the very important estuaries of our rivers concerns both the ocean and the fresh water. The proposals to use the tides for power must draw on our extensive knowledge of hydroelectric power using fresh water. The minerals that might be found under the water and the hydrocarbons we presently obtain from beneath the sea are the same minerals we find on land. Certainly the Government department dealing with our mineral resources should logically coordinate this undersea effort. The agencies dealing with sport fisheries are in the Department of the Interior. It seems logical to me to include them in a Department of Natural Resources.

Of course, many new techniques for working in an aquatic environment must be found, but this would be the reason for coordinating all oceanography activities under an Assistant Secretary in the Department of Natural Resources.

Senator MUSKIE has pointed out the problem of the low ministerial status of our representatives at conferences on international marine affairs. I think the representation by a Secretary of one of our most important Cabinet departments would correct this situation.

The problems of our Great Lakes share some similarities to our fresh water problems and some similarities to those of the estuaries and oceans. In this new Department, efforts to meet this unique situation could be coordinated at all levels.

An Interagency Committee on Oceanography now coordinates the work of five departments, three independent agencies, and 22 bureaus and offices. But no one working in the area is in a high level policy position. What we need is top-level direction on policy and an adequate staff and budget.

Actually, this bill providing for a Department of Natural Resources is quite simple. The bill provides for a Secretary of Natural Resources and a Deputy Secretary. It provides for two Under Secretaries, one for water and one for land.

The jurisdiction of the Under Secretary for Water includes: the functions exercised by the Bureau of Reclamation; the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Army; the work of the Soil Conservation Service under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; the Water Pollution Control Authority; coordination of river basin plans with the Federal Power Commission; the Bonneville Power Administration; the Southwestern Power Administration; and all agencies in the Department of the Interior that have water resource matters as their principal concern.

The Under Secretary for Water will supervise an Assistant Secretary for Oceanography. This Assistant Secretary will have jurisdiction over the functions of the sea grant programs of the Na-

tional Science Foundation, the National Oceanographic Data Center, and the Coastal Engineering Research Center. It would also be wise to transfer to this Assistant Secretary the portion of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service which deals with the fisheries resources of the oceans. An office might also be created to coordinate efforts of our other mineral resource agencies in development of the minerals in and under the ocean.

While I have not provided for further administrative division in the bill, it would appear logical to divide the responsibility of the Under Secretary for Land into four branches, each headed by an Assistant Secretary.

The Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management could report to an Assistant Secretary for Land Resources. The National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation could report to an Assistant Secretary for Recreation and Wildlife. The Bureau of Mines, Geological Survey, the Office of Coal Research, and the several other agencies in the Department of the Interior with responsibility in the fields of minerals and fuels could report to an Assistant Secretary for Minerals and Fuels. The fourth Assistant Secretary would supervise our air pollution abatement program.

The adoption of this proposal is long overdue. The task of protecting and wisely utilizing the land, the water, the forest, the wildlife, is one task. All these resources are interdependent. Today, all require wise management on a national basis.

The President has made clear his intention of consolidating functions and services. He is phasing out installations which have completed performance of the functions they were assigned. It is time we consolidated our planning or resource management.

An additional gain will be in the efficiency of State operation. The States cannot protect their resources without Federal cooperation. Our river basins, our waterfowl, our forests, our lakes do not recognize State boundaries. The State responsibilities in these fields are widespread. We should make it possible for them to carry out their responsibilities.

This legislation is introduced because the structure of our resource agencies is unnecessarily fragmented; because this fragmentation is preventing the quality of conservation and management that the public interest requires; and because the Congress has failed to give this question the attention it deserves.

What the bill will do is to enable one executive department to coordinate, at the levels of Under Secretary and Secretary, the activities of all agencies dealing with natural resources. It will enable the President, the Congress, and an executive department to effectively evaluate the Nation's resource requirements and the investment needed to meet them. It will provide the data and the management structure on which long-range planning can be based. It will enable us to consider with sufficient leadtime the raw material requirements

of our industries. It will provide coordinated administration of farflung resource programs. It will make it easier for the States, counties, and cities to carry out their expanding responsibilities in the natural resource field.

My greatest pleasure since coming to the Senate has been in working in this conservation area—to improve our parks and recreation areas, to develop our mineral and water resources and to conserve our fish and wildlife. I want to see Congress meet its responsibilities by giving the executive branch the most effective resource management organization possible.

Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference my bill to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Natural Resources and to transfer certain agencies to and from such Department, and I ask that it be left on the desk for 2 weeks for cosponsors.

I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and lie at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 886) to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Natural Resources and to transfer certain agencies to and from such Department introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 886

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Natural Resources Act of 1967".

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

SEC. 2. (a) The Department of the Interior is hereby redesignated the Department of Natural Resources, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby redesignated the Secretary of Natural Resources.

(b) All laws, orders, regulations, and other matters relating to the Department of the Interior or to the Secretary of the Interior shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, be deemed to relate to the Department of Natural Resources or to the Secretary of Natural Resources, respectively.

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

SEC. 3. The Under Secretary of the Interior authorized under the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes", approved May 9, 1935, shall be known as the Deputy Secretary of Natural Resources and shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level II of the Executive Schedule by section 5312 of title 5 of the United States Code.

UNDER SECRETARIES OF NATURAL RESOURCES

SEC. 4. (a) There shall be in the Department of Natural Resources an Under Secretary of Natural Resources for Water, and an Under Secretary of Natural Resources for Lands, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) Clause (8) of section 5314 of title

5. of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(8) Under Secretary of Natural Resources for Water and Under Secretary of Natural Resources for Lands."

TRANSFERS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 5. (a) (1) The Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior is transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and all functions of the Secretary of the Interior being administered through the Bureau of Indian Affairs are transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(2) The Office of Territories in the Department of the Interior is transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and all functions of the Secretary of the Interior being administered through the Office of Territories are transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) All personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are to be used primarily with respect to any office, agency, bureau, or function transferred under the provisions of this section, are transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TRANSFERS FROM DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SEC. 6. (a) The Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, together with such personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds as are determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be used primarily with respect to functions being administered through such service, is transferred to the Department of Natural Resources, and all functions of the Secretary of Agriculture being administered through such service are transferred to the Secretary of Natural Resources.

(b) (1) The functions of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1008), and the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), are transferred to the Secretary of Natural Resources.

(2) All personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily with respect to any function transferred under the provisions of this subsection, are transferred to the Department of Natural Resources.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS; CIVIL WORKS FUNCTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) The civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army and all such functions of the Secretary of the Army with respect to or being administered through such Corps are transferred to the Secretary of Natural Resources.

(b) All nonmilitary personnel, property, records, obligation, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily with respect to any function transferred under the provisions of this section, are transferred to the Department of Natural Resources.

(c) In time of war or such other national emergency as the President determines, he may transfer—

(1) the functions transferred under subsection (a) of this section to the Secretary of the Army, and

(2) such personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds as he determines are used with respect to such functions to the Department of the Army. At the end of the war or the period of national emergency the President shall transfer such functions back to the Secretary of Natural Resources, and he shall transfer such personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended appropriations, allocations, and other funds back to the Department of Natural Resources.

TRANSFERS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY; OCEANOGRAPHIC FUNCTIONS

SEC. 8. The National Oceanographic Data Center in the Department of the Navy together with such nonmilitary personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds as are determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be used primarily with respect to functions being administered through such center, is transferred to the Department of Natural Resources, and all nonmilitary functions of the Secretary of the Navy with respect to or being administered through such Center are transferred to the Secretary of Natural Resources.

TRANSFERS FROM THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION; SEA GRANT PROGRAM

SEC. 9. (a) The functions of the National Science Foundation under title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 998) relating to sea grant programs, are transferred to the Secretary of Natural Resources.

(b) All personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily with respect to any function transferred under the provisions of this section, are transferred to the Department of Natural Resources.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE; AIR POLLUTION CONTROL FUNCTIONS

SEC. 10. (a) The functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857 et seq.), the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 3251), and all other air pollution control functions of such Secretary are transferred to the Secretary of Natural Resources.

(b) All personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily with respect to any function transferred under the provisions of this section, are transferred to the Department of Natural Resources.

AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL POWER ACT

SEC. 11. The first sentence of section 4(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 797(e)) is amended by (1) striking out "the chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army", and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary of Natural Resources", and (2) inserting immediately before the period a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no license affecting the comprehensive plan of any river basin commission developed pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act shall be issued until the plans of the dam or other structures affecting any such comprehensive plan have been approved by the Secretary of Natural Resources".

TRANSFER MATTERS

SEC. 12. All laws relating to any office, agency, bureau, or function transferred under this Act shall, insofar as such laws are applicable, remain in full force and effect. Any transfer of personnel pursuant to

this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned. All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by any office, agency, or bureau or in connection with any function transferred by this Act, and in effect at the time of the transfer, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any office, agency, or bureau or any officer of the United States acting in his official capacity shall abate by reason of any transfer made pursuant to this Act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the appropriate office, agency, or bureau or officer of the United States.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 13. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, make a report to the President for submission to the Congress on the activities of the Department during the preceding calendar year.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 14. The provisions of this Act shall be effective after ninety days following its date of enactment.

SELECTION OF METHOD OF DEPRECIATION BY REGULATED INDUSTRIES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prevent Federal regulatory agencies from directly or indirectly denying regulated industries the right to exercise business judgment in selecting their method of depreciation or to account for depreciation on a deferred tax accounting basis, together with an explanatory statement, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 887) to prevent Federal regulatory agencies from directly or indirectly denying regulated industries the right to exercise business judgment in selecting their method of depreciation or to account for depreciation on a deferred tax accounting basis, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanatory statement, presented by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL DEALING WITH TREATMENT OF DEPRECIATION FOR REGULATED INDUSTRIES

In introducing this bill, the problem with which I am concerned is the treatment by the regulatory agencies of the accelerated depreciation provisions under section 167(b) of the Internal Revenue Code. It has come to my attention that some of the regulatory agencies have taken actions which apparently are designed in effect to compel industries under their jurisdiction to use accelerated tax depreciation even though the in-

the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT— AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 102

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is essential that every effort be made to reinforce the declared policy of our Government that the war in Vietnam should be brought to a peaceful conclusion by negotiation at the earliest possible date and that, as the Manila communique declared, we should withdraw our troops as soon as possible.

I am sure that is the sentiment of every Member of the Senate. In order to make that sentiment completely clear, Mr. President, I submit the following amendment to S. 665 to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missile, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes:

At the end of the bill add the following:

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 401. It is the sense of the Congress that these funds shall be used in pursuit of the Administration's aims for a peaceful settlement under effective guarantees in Vietnam, including (1) the right of the people of South Vietnam to choose their own government free of outside coercion, (2) the withdrawal of foreign troops and the dismantling of foreign installations after the termination of hostilities, as pledged in the Communique of the Manila Conference, October 25, 1966, (3) the achievement of peaceful reunification if desired by the free choice of all Vietnamese, as stated in the Manila Communique, and (4) the grant of substantial aid by the United States to the countries of the Mekong River Basin for the multipurpose development of that fertile but turbulent region, as pledged by the President in his address at Johns Hopkins University on April 7, 1965."

Mr. President, this proposed amendment expresses the sense of the Congress that it gives approval to the stated aims of the Communique of Manila and of the President's address at Johns Hopkins University. It makes clear that our aim in the granting of this authorization is not confined to the making of war, but that underneath we have a great and primary desire to see the realization of the peaceful goals we have enunciated. It is an encouragement to the administration to pursue those goals of peace with the utmost vigor, while it does not deny our boys under orders, as they engage in military action, the things they need with which to fight effectively. It does not change policy, but it places the emphasis where it belongs, on the pursuit of peace. There are some who would like to, and perhaps who will, vote against the appropriations. But this amendment offers an avenue to those, much more in number, who like myself find it necessary to vote for them—although with reluctance—while desiring to make completely clear the belief that peace, not violence, must be our aim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the amendment being offered?

Mr. HARTKE. I offer the amend-

ment, and ask that it be printed. It is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is being submitted for printing?

Mr. HARTKE. It is being submitted for printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] as cosponsors of S. 188, a bill to create a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] as a cosponsor of S. 199, a bill which has at one time passed the Senate and which I hope will soon pass again, to create a Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, about 10 days ago I introduced Senate bill 877, to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, and asked at that time that it remain at the desk for cosponsors until February 21. I am informed that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] understood that it was to remain there until today; and in his effort to have his name added as a cosponsor, he was told that it was closed the 21st.

I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 877, the name of the Senator from South Carolina be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors of the following bills, concurrent resolution, and resolution:

Authority of January 30, 1967:

S. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the need for members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to be qualified to understand the problems of all groups of workers throughout our Nation: Mr. ALLOTT.

Authority of February 7, 1967:

S. 877. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental

and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

S. 886. A bill to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Natural Resources and to transfer certain agencies to and from such Department: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MCGEE, and Mr. METCALF.

Authority of February 16, 1967:

S. Res. 83. Resolution providing for study and reevaluation of U.S.-European relations: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. PERCY.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 9, 1967, the names of Mr. CLARK and Mr. SMATHERS were added as additional cosponsors of amendment No. 90, intended to be proposed by Mr. DONN, to the bill (S. 1) to amend the Federal Firearms Act, submitted by Mr. DONN on February 9, 1967.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech to Weirton chapter, West Virginia Society of Professional Engineers, on air and water pollution and Weirton Steel Co. statement on its facilities and projections for air and stream pollution control.

ROY ROBERTS, NEWSPAPERMAN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Missouri and America lost one of the great newspapermen of this century in the death last night of Roy A. Roberts in Kansas City at the age of 79. He had been in the hospital since last November 13, but never lost his interest in the affairs of his area, the Midwest, the Nation, and the world.

Born in Muscotah, Kans., on November 25, 1887, Mr. Roberts attended the University of Kansas from 1905 to 1908. He entered newspaper work with the Lawrence, Kans., World in 1905 and later became city editor of that paper. He joined the Kansas City Star in 1909, covered four sessions of the Missouri State Legislature at Jefferson City, was a Washington correspondent for the Star from 1915 to 1928, managing editor of the Star from 1928 to 1945. He became president and general manager in 1947. In 1963 he gave up his position as president, editor, and general manager of the Star, but continued in active consultation on daily policy as chairman of the board, retiring from that position on January 1, 1965, under a mandatory retirement plan which he himself had put into effect a short time before that date in order to assure that the Star, owned completely by its employees, would always have new and young leadership. He continued to have a personal office just off the big news and editorial room of the Star and was often consulted by those in active management.

Although Mr. Roberts had been active for many years in the Republican Party

ited the war will grow. An unlimited war may result in a military victory over North Vietnam but at what price? At the price of a ravaged nation and a shattered people? At the price of our own moral corruption?

A military victory over North Vietnam would not bring peace to the South. A defeated Ho Chi Minh, with his 50,000 troops returned to the North, would still leave 100,000 Vietcong and 150,000 civilian guerrillas continuing the war in the South.

I am convinced that the best hope for establishing peace negotiations lies in a cessation of bombing and a de-escalation of the war. But we must pursue other possibilities for initiating a peace dialogue.

The Administration has stated that we are willing to settle the war according to the terms of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962. A stated willingness to work within the framework of a Geneva Conference is not enough. We must actively promote the reconvening of the Conference and use all appropriate means to convince the members of the Conference of our sincerity and determination in seeking peace talks.

We should explore all the possibilities of using the framework of other international bodies to initiate peace discussions. Secretary General U Thant has undertaken many attempts to bring the parties of the conflict together for peace conversations and more than once the United States has refused a specific offer for negotiations that have been made through Thant. We must re-establish and re-emphasize our desire to go to any place, at any time and discuss with anyone the possibilities for peace. Since the 37 day bombing pause in early 1966 we have made no official attempt to engage this body in the search for peace. We should introduce resolutions before both the Security Council and the General Assembly that are designed to put the United Nations in an active and responsible role in initiating the talks.

These suggestions for soliciting the aid of international organizations in the search for peace have been made many times by many people. I believe that it is through such international and politically independent organizations that a peace settlement with equal justice for all parties is most likely to evolve.

In our search for an immediate end to the war in Vietnam through peaceful settlement, we must not overlook the very real possibility of our failure and the continuation of the war for many years. If efforts to initiate a dialogue for peace fails, we must be prepared to change our strategy in waging the war. The United States cannot afford the economic and manpower costs of a long war in Vietnam. Also, we cannot afford the resentment and tensions that would grow throughout Asia if our dominating military presence in this area was prolonged and increased. We must prepare for the long-term possibilities of the conflict in South Vietnam by encouraging the initiation of an all-Asian conference. At this conference, we would ask for the assistance of Asian nations in returning to them the primary responsibility for their own protection and for returning to them the leadership role we have assumed in their area.

The conference would work out plans for de-Americanizing the war in Vietnam and for the assumption by Asians of their responsibility for maintaining peace in their area of the world. President Marcos of the Philippines declared that there must be Asian solutions for Asian problems and we should do everything possible to encourage the Asians to begin assuming a more active role in peacekeeping efforts.

Specifically, out of this all-Asian conference should grow a detailed plan and schedule for the substitution of American troops in Vietnam by Asian troops. The President has warned us that the conflict in Vietnam could last for another 10 or 15 years and we should not wait another half-decade be-

fore taking positive steps to turn this war over to the people who have a primary stake in its outcome.

A second responsibility that the all-Asian conference should assume would be the initiation of an Asian diplomatic offensive to reduce tensions and misunderstandings between adversaries in the conflict and build a bridge of trust between the two sides so that the atmosphere for peace discussions is improved.

A third goal of the conference would be the creation of a framework for an eventual Southeast Asian common market based on agricultural economies. Our goal of peace and stability in South Vietnam will not automatically be reached with the conclusion of the present conflict. When the hostilities cease in South Vietnam, the prospects for continued peace will depend to a great extent on this area's ability to progress economically and to meet the rising expectations of its people. None of the countries of South East Asia is large enough to support strong and viable economies in the near future. Through tariff agreements and co-operative planning, however, these countries could coordinate the development of their individual and total resources. They should also be able to avoid the initial expense and long-term inefficiency of duplicating basic agriculture-oriented industries necessary to the development of each country.

South Vietnam must be economically stable if peace is to endure at the conclusion of the war. It must be politically stable also if it is to survive the political pressures and turmoil that are sure to surface when the military hostilities cease. If South Vietnam is to be capable of directing its affairs when the fighting stops, the United States must now relinquish its dominant control of political affairs and minimize its impact on other aspects of life in South Vietnam.

The United States and the South Vietnamese government are asking the people of that country to make great sacrifices in the name of democracy and independence. But they have never lived under democracy or independence and have little idea of what they are being asked to fight for. We must give purpose to their sacrifices by allowing them truly democratic institutions that they can believe in and be willing to defend. We must, to be specific, give our complete support during the coming elections for the establishment of civilian government in South Vietnam. Only a civilian government will be regarded by the South Vietnamese as having any autonomy from the United States and as having any responsiveness to their wishes.

The Administration has justified our involvement in this conflict as a defense of the independence of South Vietnam against the aggression of the North. But the South Vietnamese have no freedom for us to so gallantly protect. Our massive presence in this small country has effectively eliminated whatever sovereignty might have existed and the "independence" of South Vietnam is a fiction. How sovereign is a government that we dominate and that would collapse in days if we ceased supporting it? How independent are a people who now rely completely on a foreign nation for their defense and who must follow the orders issued by that nation? How independent is a country whose entire economy depends on benevolent subsidy by a foreign power?

If the people of South Vietnam are to believe in their own independence and be willing to fight for it, the United States must minimize its impact on Vietnamese life as much as possible and must not interfere with political processes of the country. A belief in and determination for independence cannot be compromised with the puppet government of a foreign power.

I have just outlined possible methods of achieving peace in South Vietnam through

negotiations and through a change in our strategy designed to find an Asian solution for this basically Asian problem. But I do not believe that we will be successful in seeking peace through either method if we continue to misinterpret and distort the realities of this conflict; if we refuse to honestly admit our past miscalculations; and if we lack the courage to change the policies that have defeated our purposes since 1950. This is, I believe, where we must begin.

DI LUZIO SPEAKS OUT ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Pollution Control, Mr. Frank C. Di Luzio, spoke before the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in San Francisco, Calif., on March 13, on the subject "Practical Steps Toward Pollution Control."

In his remarks, he pointed out that, with the legislation passed by the 89th Congress, it was hoped that there might be a "better orchestrated effort and more harmony" in water pollution control, explaining the practical applications of better orchestrated efforts and more harmony and discussing the future hope for effective control of water pollution.

Because of the continued responsibilities of the Congress in this area, I believe that Mr. Di Luzio's views are of special merit.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARD POLLUTION CONTROL
(Remarks of Frank C. D. Di Luzio, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Pollution Control, before the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, San Francisco, Calif., Mar. 13, 1967)

I greatly appreciate this opportunity to talk about "Practical Steps Toward Pollution Control" before this distinguished assembly of wildlife and resource authorities.

One need not look very far in any direction from any vantage point in the land to conclude that practical steps to control pollution have become an urgent need in this country.

PAST PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSERVATION COMMUNITY

Your part in this campaign to protect and promote environmental quality has not been an easy one. You have won some victories, but you may have lost even more. The quality of our environment has declined. For the most part, it has been a war of attrition and you have been on the losing side against the forces of "progress" and "economic growth"—conscious and unconscious—which erode the quality of our environment.

You have only to list some of the past battles lost—species wiped out or critically endangered by man—the passenger pigeon, health hen, whooping crane, blue whale, as well as the ruined rivers, the spoiled land, the disrupted ecosystems.

And as you and I look ahead, the road will not be easy nor the outcome certain. The future can go either way—for you or against you. Neither victory nor defeat is predetermined. All depends on human effort and the wise use of the knowledge which technology gives us.

The part you play will be critical in determining whether we promote economic growth, and at the same time, protect the quality of our environment, or, whether we

promote economic growth, but degrade our environment—our water, land, and air—with the result that our health, our economic growth and survival are ultimately threatened.

Although America's natural landscape contains great beauty and diversity, much of this can be lost and damaged through pollution, misuse and mismanagement. And we will not be able to escape, as we do now, by catching the nearest jet to some unspoiled, exotic island. Every part of the world will eventually face the same problem of maintaining quality, beauty and diversity in nature. We had better start managing wisely here at home to maintain an environment worth living in because escape will not be possible.

Until recent years, except for the conservationists and a few like-minded people in Government, not many people were concerned about the environment, except when it didn't behave to their liking. Air, land, water—these were thought to be inexhaustible resources provided for man's use and enjoyment. If a river was ruined for fish, that was thought to be one of the prices that had to be paid for progress. Ecology, if the word ever cropped up in the general hustle and din, was something for the biologists—or the birds.

However, a new era of environmental management and control has now arrived. Granted that this new age is still far less real in practice than in policy, still it has come, and it is here to stay.

And none too soon. Thoughtless misuse—even heretofore acceptable but thoughtless use of our air, land, and water resources—has reached a critical point. Pollution of the environment already constitutes a serious drag on the progress and well-being of our society. Not only are desirable uses of the environment curtailed by pollution, but even uses that fall clearly into the category of necessities are in many respects hampered or threatened.

You know the situation as well as or better than I, and you and I know how it came about. The important thing is what lies ahead in water pollution control. We have had the overture. The main symphony is now about to begin.

The conservation community has stirred up public reaction and awareness of pollution problems. But while molding public opinion, it was like an orchestra made up of virtuosos, each a master of a particular instrument, but each playing from his own music.

Now, with the legislation passed by the 89th Congress, we hope to have a better orchestrated effort and more harmony than discord in water pollution control.

The situation reminds me of the story about the piano-playing cat.

It seems that many years ago in the mid-west there was a man who owned a tomcat which played the piano. Not only did the tomcat play the piano, but he played classical music.

A Greenwich Village impresario, upon hearing about the cat, was determined to hire him and visited the tomcat's owner to see about obtaining a contract for the cat to play in Greenwich Village. He asked the owner, "Will the cat play for me?" The owner replied, "He'll play for anybody." The cat then climbed upon the piano stool and started playing. The impresario was so overcome by the beauty of the music that he started talking to himself out loud: "The first thing I have to do is to get this cat under contract, and then have him orchestrated." The cat disappeared and hasn't been seen since.

The point is we must be careful and reasonable in our public statements on pollution control. Our terms must be explicit and understandable. Fancy terms may build unnecessary resistance and opposition.

We need more harmony among the voices

which speak out on conservation and pollution problems.

We need better orchestration of effort—of words and actions—not only within the conservation community, but also between the groups involved in causing as well as curing our pollution problems—industry, agriculture, municipalities, Federal and State Government and the public as a whole.

FUTURE OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Looking down the road a few years, there are many paths to travel toward effective water pollution control.

In the first place, there will be a greatly intensified effort to control pollution at the source.

Where needed, there will be larger and more effective municipal waste treatment facilities. More and more of these facilities will convert waste water into water of a quality suitable for limited reuse, particularly for recreation use. This is already being done on a sizeable pilot scale and will become practicable on a large scale in the near future.

At-source control of pollution from industrial plants will be attacked on two fronts: Through new or improved treatment methods and through process changes that will reduce or even eliminate the output of wastes requiring treatment.

We are conducting a study of industrial water pollution problems, and we hope to help industry pinpoint its specific marginal plants where increased costs for pollution control facilities would force a plant out of business. We will then try to help find solutions for these problems.

However, if we are to help industry, we must know more about the contents of industry's effluents and about the processes which produce them.

If industry expects us to help them, they must also help us by providing information about the chemical composition of their waste discharges and about the nature of the processes which generate these effluents. In this way, we can possibly make available research results and technical data to assist them in solving their pollution problem. Moreover, if we are going to be able to justify to the taxpayers and Congress the aid which we give to industry, we must be able to show the progress toward pollution control which we make in giving this aid. To evaluate our progress toward controlling industrial pollution, we must have more information about industry's effluents. Whatever data industry provides will be treated as proprietary information.

Among other things, thermal pollution is on the way out. With what we know about heat-exchange today, thermal pollution is already technologically inexcusable. It will become inexcusable from any standpoint in the near future.

At the same time, research will be intensified to control the less obvious, more exotic forms of pollution now resulting from complex manufacturing processes. Pollution control technology has lagged behind production technology, and a fast catching-up is in order.

In the second place, efforts will be intensified to reduce and control pollution from diffuse sources.

Through a combination of public pressure and improved technology, we can look forward to a progressive reduction in pollution, for example, from construction projects.

We are going to find some answers to the problem of the combination sewer which aggravates the pollution control problem in all of the older sections of our large cities. This will be brought under control through, in all probability, a combination of efforts. Better city sanitation, for example, would reduce the amount of pollution from the runoff from city streets. In some communities flushing the sewers at night when treatment plant capacity is largely unused

may make sense. At the same time, through empoundments—both surface and underground—and by other means, pollution will be controlled for future treatment and release. A good deal of work is being supported in this area also, and there is more to come.

Improved land management with the specific objective of water pollution control is still another predictable development in the increasing effort to prevent pollutants from diffuse sources from trickling and pouring into our lakes and streams. An increased sense of responsibility on the part of the landowner—large and small—would be an invaluable contribution to the pollution control effort. The floating fence posts, broken boards, and other debris get into the water from somebody's land.

Finally, I think we can also foresee a greatly intensified effort to control pollution in our lakes, rivers, and streams themselves.

From any standpoint, one of the most urgent needs in water pollution control today is to slow up the eutrophication of lakes through overenrichment by agricultural and municipal wastes. Lake Erie is the most notable—and potentially tragic—example. But many others—large and small—are in the same desperate condition.

The speed of man-caused eutrophication can be slowed. The most obvious and most urgent need is to stop using such lakes as convenient sinks for wastes. Destratification, aeration, filtering, and other techniques are not beyond reach. Even eutrophication from natural causes can be slowed. The least we can do is to stop killing our lakes through penny-wise, pound-foolish waste disposal practices. Disposal is perhaps the wrong word. These wastes are hidden, not disposed of. They and/or their effects come back to haunt us.

Silting of both rivers and lakes is yet another pollution problem that can be dealt with through multiple approaches. I have mentioned better land practices and better construction practices. Here, too, there are opportunities for preventive action, as a backstop to other efforts. One approach that we are exploring is the use of polyelectrolytes to settle out the silt at selected locations so that it can be removed in bulk, economically.

NEED TO PROTECT AND EXPAND OUR ENVIRONMENTAL OPTIONS

In looking ahead, we need to protect and expand our environmental options and freedom of choice in future uses of nature.

The growth of population, of technology, and of human wants and needs has already foreclosed some of our choices for the future.

There is a range of possible future environmental options which we must try to keep open and expand if possible.

For example, some wilderness advocates might like to see all remaining undeveloped areas remain in wilderness while some development advocates might seek to whittle away at our remaining wilderness.

We need both—wilderness and development—as well as the range of choices in between. We need to preserve and expand all of our environmental options—all except for one—the destructive use of the environment and the use of the environment as a free sink for untreated waste. We want to foreclose this use before it forecloses all other uses.

Some conservationists say that we should leave things alone—that we should not use the natural environment.

But I believe in wise rather than non-use of our resources.

I am a conservationist who believes that man should enjoy nature. I do not believe we should lock nature up so that man cannot use it.

I am not primarily interested in fish and wildlife for their own sake, but for man's

sake. The reason for this is that fish, wildlife, and nature are good for man. They are necessary for his well-being, both physically and spiritually.

The impression in many circles is that many purists want a cold trout stream behind every house—even in situations where they never occurred naturally. We know that every stream can't be a trout stream. Some never were in the first place, but no stream should be an open sewer.

Perhaps the purists expect too much from man. They tend to set unattainable—all or nothing—goals which we have neither the technical nor the economic means to support.

We must set before the American people conservation and pollution control goals which are attainable—technically and economically—but if improvement is to be made, they should also be difficult to achieve.

We should always reach into the future—out beyond what is comfortable, economically or technically. We should try for hard but achievable goals.

Conservationists are accused of favoring the interests of nature—of plant and beast—against the interests of man.

Yet, do these interests so irreconcilably conflict? Man is part of nature and his interests are served by environmental quality and healthy ecosystems. It is only where the interests of man are incorrectly seen that the interests of nature are thought to be in irreconcilable conflict with those of man.

Although nature may be at man's disposal, this doesn't mean it is meant to be his dispose-all.

Science and technology give man great power to control, destroy and create, and the question is: To what ends and how should he use this power?

Was it inevitable that the passenger pigeon and the heath hen became extinct or that the whooping crane be endangered? I think not.

Is it man's evolutionary mission to destroy and make extinct other species? If anyone thinks it is—he had better look at the long run effects of this attitude—since the destruction of man's environment points ultimately to the destruction of man himself.

It is imperative that we preserve our environmental choices, alternatives and options for the future and for future generations because it means the preservation of our freedom to choose. It means preserving to the best of our ability the freedom of future generations to choose what uses they wish to make of the environment.

Our problem is to preserve and expand our possibilities for choice of the uses which we make of the environment under conditions of rapid increase in population, in technology, in human needs, and in pollution.

We need to preserve and expand our environmental options while, at the same time, we also protect and promote our freedom of choice in the way we go about preserving these options.

Your role in promoting these freedoms is crucial.

STEPS TOWARD POLLUTION CONTROL

We live in a world where man's supply of resources is not unlimited, where further exploitation of scarce resources becomes more costly, and where his demands are increasing even more rapidly than population.

Basic scientific research and applied technology can help man to discover new sources of supply, new uses for old resources, and to develop substitutes for depleted resources. Development in science and technology will enable us to increase the levels of annual sustained yield of our renewable resources such as forests, fish, and wildlife and will help us to find new uses for these products.

And science can, to a certain extent, discover substitutes for our depletable resources such as coal, oil, and minerals. Research can, in short, expand production and can help us to keep pace with increased demands.

But just as there are, ultimately, limits to our resources, there are also limits to what science and technology can do. There are limits to the ability of science to help us meet the growing demands associated with increased per capital consumption and increased population.

There are limits to the capacity of science to extricate us from any future mistakes which we may make in the conservation and management of our resources.

And we should not and cannot depend upon the scientists to save us from our mistakes.

We live in a world where there is a predicted doubling of the world's population by the year 2010—only some 40 years from now—with the associated increased demands which will be placed on our resources. We live in a world where the United States consumes a very large proportion of the world's resources. We live in a world in which there are and will be eventually limits to the ability of our resources and those of the world—even with the help of science—to satisfy the increased demands created by increased levels of consumption and increased population.

Given this situation, we must consider some of the practical steps and necessary elements for effective resource, conservation and pollution control policy.

Many of these activities, if they are being performed, are not carried out on a systematic basis for presentation to the American people.

We need to set forth our conservation and resource problems for the people of the United States on a regular, periodic basis, for discussion, debate, and decision.

Such statements of our resource and pollution problems should be based on estimates of: 1. the supply of and future demands for our resources; 2. the investments and activities required to "meet" these demands; 3. the limits to the satisfaction of these demands; and 4. the rough time span within which the limits for each resource will be reached. The statement should also set forth the alternative means for solving these problems as well as the advantages and disadvantages of the various solutions.

What is needed is a periodic statement of national, regional, state, and local resource, conservation and pollution problems, trends, needs and goals, alternative solutions, and recommendations for a long-range balanced program for research, planning, and action.

For example, we need to estimate the extent of each of our renewable and non-renewable resources, and the future demand for these resources based on such factors as population increase as well as increases in per capita consumption.

Based on these estimates, we need to calculate the limits to the fulfillment of the estimated future demand for each resource. We should, for example, attempt to estimate within a rough timespan—for instance, 25, 50, 75, 100 years—the periods during which we will reach the limits to the satisfaction of the demands for each of our renewable as well as unrenewable resources.

For example, we should know for each renewable resource—given the necessity for maximum sustained yield of that resource—the rough time span during which the estimated demand for that resource will exceed our calculations for maximum annual harvest compatible with maximum sustained yield over the years. We should also calculate for our non-renewable resources the rough time span during which projected demand will exhaust these resources.

We should then compile lists of priorities for conservation based on earliest estimated depletion date, there being some resources

which will be in danger of depletion sooner than others.

In addition to designing and implementing programs to "meet demands" for resources, we need also to look at the problem of slowing down the rate at which rapidly expanding populations put pressures on the environment for resource supply and waste disposal—for production in industry and agriculture, for transport and communications, for recreation, and, for getting rid of the waste products of all this activity.

We need to present to the American people—for decision and action—a periodic statement of our environmental options and of the alternative future environments which we can choose to foreclose or expand.

The conservation community can play a crucial role for the American public by helping to prepare, present, and choose among these alternative future environments.

For there are limits and we have already reached and passed some of them—in air, water, and land pollution—in the species destroyed or endangered.

Moreover, some of these passed limits are irreversible. The destroyed and endangered species are "early warning" signals which will teach us—if we will learn—that we are mismanaging our environment. If we ignore these signals, we do so at our ultimate peril.

The displeasing and unaesthetic environment can serve as an early warning signal for problems of environmental survival.

You have awakened Americans to the aesthetic elements, to the beautiful in man's environment and you have attempted to cure man's loss of sensitivity to natural beauty—a loss of sensitivity largely caused by a degraded environment and preoccupation with material gain.

You have done these things not only for their own sake, but also because the loss of this sensitivity may ultimately affect man's survival.

For the loss of man's aesthetic sensitivity means that man is less likely to heed early warning signals which ultimately affect his survival. And, by the time he does become aware that his survival is at stake—in problems of air, water, and land pollution—it may be too late. Irreversible and malign effects may have been created in nature.

It is still an open question whether we will learn to live in harmony with nature and our environment, or will irreversibly damage and destroy it and, in the process, ourselves.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONSERVATION COMMUNITY

Looking at the specific problem of water pollution control, I would like to outline what needs to be done and how the conservation community can help.

We need research, planning, and operations in many different areas—with regard to public attitudes, water quality standards, enforcement, river basin planning and in the creation of institutions to carry out these functions on an integrated and coordinated basis.

This will require the cooperation and coordination of all levels of Government and sectors of society—including the conservation community, industry, agriculture, municipalities and the public.

If we are to have economic growth, and at the same time, protect and promote environmental quality, we must adopt and implement new attitudes toward nature. These attitudes contain principles for managing the environment which the conservation community has helped to develop and must continue to stress to the public.

These principles include:

The necessity to calculate the long run effects of proposed actions on the total environment and ecological system.

Economic growth *plus* environmental quality.

The environment should not be used as a free sink for untreated waste.

The pollutee should not bear all the costs of pollution.

Man is part of nature, and, rather than having a mission to destroy his environment, should live in harmony with it—creatively, with the forces which work in nature—rather than trying to dominate and destroy.

In addition to developing principles for wise resource management, the conservation community has a critical role and responsibility in implementing these principles in many elements of the water pollution control program—through, for example, helping to create institutions for water resources planning, through planning for resource use in general and through participation in the hearings on water quality uses now being conducted in the various states.

The period from now until June 30 is a critical one for deciding on water quality uses in the States and I hope you will take an active part in these hearings.

Many conservation organizations helped to produce, with the Izaak Walton League, the very useful "Citizen Guide to Action for Clean Water." This guide contains a check list which, if implemented by the conservation community throughout the United States, would give an immense boost to cleaning up America's waters.

To date, twenty-two States have proposed water quality standards which are now being reviewed by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. The remaining States have yet to submit their standards.

The conservation community should take an active part in these hearings which, in effect, will set standards for determining what uses can and will be made of our water resources in the United States.

I encourage you to help the public: first, to inform themselves about local water pollution problems, needs, and goals; second, to organize themselves for action; and, third, to produce action by local government for clean water.

CONCLUSION

I see nothing but an acceleration of the anti-pollution effort in the years ahead.

The American people want effective and timely water pollution control, and I am convinced that by and large they are willing to pay for it. The same holds true for all environmental pollution.

We have effective Federal legislation on the books—legislation that was years in the making. We have a new attitude toward pollution on the part of State and municipal governments. This is far from a totally united front yet, but it is coming.

And we have increasing evidence of a new attitude on the part of business, industry, and agriculture. This, too, is far from constituting a united front. But not so many years ago there was an almost united front on the part of business and industry against water pollution control. Now the winds of business and industry policy are shifting.

Much of what has been accomplished is the result of the work of the great conservation interests of this country. Now, the conservationists have some important new allies. Now the voices have been orchestrated. The task will not be easy. It will not be accomplished in a few months or even a few years. But it can be done, and much of it can and should be done in a few years.

In closing, my only counsel—counsel that I daresay is superfluous—can be summed up in a few words. Be reasonable in your goals but impatient for results. Keep up the pressure for the things that you know can be done now. Do not settle for half measures, when you know that full measures are both needed and possible. It is our job in the Government to spearhead the drive, with a carrot and a stick, to clean up America's waters. With your continued help, and general public understanding and support, we can and will.

SMOKE FROM "GUNSMOKE" LINGERS ON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, following my Senate floor remarks reporting my enjoyment as a viewer of the weekly television program "Gunsmoke," and my hope that the series could be continued, some ripples of notice made their appearance in my home State of West Virginia. Or perhaps I could more appropriately state that additional smoke began to waft its way upward in the wake of my comments on "Gunsmoke." Among the more recent of these notices, I call attention to the March 12 editorial in the Sunday Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va., which really adds a "smokey" chapter to the "Gunsmoke" saga.

In an effort to clear away the smoke, I wish to say, "Ah, shucks, fellows, can't a chap just plain enjoy watching a rootin'-tootin' westerner without having his psyche scrutinized?"

I am happy to note that the editors of the Fairmont, W. Va., Times; the Weirton, W. Va., Daily Times; the Martinsburg, W. Va., Journal; and the Williamson, W. Va., Daily News, seem to have had no trouble in grasping that innocent possibility, as shown by their remarks in their respective editorials of March 13, March 14, March 15, and March 16, respectively.

I ask unanimous consent that all these editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Mar. 12, 1967]

THESE FACTS MAY CHANGE BYRD'S "GUNSMOKE" STAND

The Washington Post, which referred to West Virginia's Sen. Robert C. Byrd as a man of narrow vision, simply doesn't know the breadth of the senator's interests.

Sen. Byrd's courageous demand that "Gunsmoke" be returned to television will stand as an example, we suspect, to millions of steely-eyed viewers who Support Their Local Police by vicariously gunning down the lawless mobs threatening the tranquility of Dodge City.

This being the probable case, it is with heavy heart that we point out to Sen. Byrd some facts that might have escaped his innocent eye.

To begin, there is a clear implication in very nearly every "Gunsmoke" plot that Marshal Matt Dillon's relationship with Miss Kitty is something other than platonic. To put it coarsely, there is hanky-panky that is obvious to any eye except that of a U.S. senator anxious to find wholesomeness in every situation.

Another thing Matt Dillon has been known to associate with Indians who, of course, are nonwhite. Dillon's behavior in these instances has differed from the most insufferable civil rights demonstrator, and on several occasions he has shot and killed white men while protecting his nonwhite friends.

And finally, what of Sen. Byrd's own cherished "Man in the House Rule" which denies District of Columbia welfare payments to any family in whose home an inspector finds a man? Miss Kitty's status as a possible welfare recipient is clouded somewhat by this rule.

Armed with the foregoing information, Sen. Byrd, we believe, can make a more reasoned analysis of the cowboy show whose return to television he asked in a Senate speech. He might even change his mind about permitting American citizens to view it.

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, Mar. 13, 1967]

HAZARDOUS CRITICISM

Looking for any excuse to put Sen. Robert C. Byrd in a bad light, the Charleston Gazette and the Morgantown Dominion-News have attempted to read something sinister into his speech a few days ago on the Senate floor in defense of the television show, "Gunsmoke."

Somehow the Charleston-Morgantown anti-Byrd axis equates his remarks with the West Virginia senator's stand for law enforcement. The manner in which Marshal Matt Dillon disposes of the forces against law and order appeals to Byrd, these editors believe, because he has spoken out against court decisions which seem to put enforcement agencies at a disadvantage in their constant war against criminals.

We have a feeling that Senator Byrd put in a good word for "Gunsmoke" simply because he likes to watch it and without special reference to its sociolegal aspects. In challenging Byrd's support of the popular horse opera, the Charleston and Morgantown editors are risking alienation of all "Gunsmoke" addicts in West Virginia.

And they could be as numerous as those who have elected Robert Carlyle Byrd to every office he ever sought, including the 515,015 who voted for him for the Senate in 1964.

[From the Weirton (W. Va.) Daily Times, Mar. 14, 1967]

MATT DILLON RIDES AGAIN

Marshal Dillon, Festus Hagin, Doc Adams and Kitty Russell have a great champion in Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D) of West Virginia.

He helped rescue them from a CBS order for cancellation of their program. CBS reversed its cancellation order and found a spot for Gunsmoke on Monday nights.

There is so much mediocrity in television programs that the cancellation of Gunsmoke provided a storm of protests. Many critics considered it the best weekly program on television. The Fairmont Times lamented that the loss of Gunsmoke would be a "major tragedy in the field of television."

Sen. Byrd fired a few verbal rounds on the Senate floor in protest to the cancellation of Gunsmoke.

He has been a regular viewer of Gunsmoke on Saturday nights.

In his Senate address, he declared that the termination of Gunsmoke was "a major down-grading of television entertainment."

He questioned the accuracy of ratings that threatened to gun down TV's best known dispenser of frontier justice.

Sen. Byrd has been a champion of the lawmen and a severe critic of the Supreme Court decisions on the arresting and questioning of criminal suspects by the police.

[From the Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal, Mar. 16, 1967]

SENATOR BYRD AND "GUNSMOKE"

West Virginia's Senator Robert C. Byrd has added to his laurels on the national level as being one of the saviors of "Gunsmoke," perennial western of television fame.

It seems that after the network which had carried the series for some dozen years announced that it would be discontinued after this season, Senator Byrd took to the Senate floor and let it be known that he enjoyed watching "Gunsmoke" and hated to see it leave the air. This apparently became a rallying point for "Gunsmoke" lovers throughout the nation and such a hue and cry went up that the network made one of its rare decisions to reverse itself so that "Gunsmoke" with its Marshal Matt Dillon, Kitty and "Doc" will be back with us again for at least another season.

Maybe Senator Byrd shouldn't have taken up the time of the Senate with a speech on such an irrelevant subject, although it was

quire future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 7763. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7764. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to permit free entry of apparatus which enables an amputee to operate certain controls on a motor vehicle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 7765. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7766. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility for pensions under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 7767. A bill for the relief of the living descendants of the Creek Nation of 1814; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 7768. A bill to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for Government employees and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7769. A bill to provide for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7770. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7771. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 7772. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive and judicial branches; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 7773. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 7774. A bill to prohibit political influence with respect to appointments, promotions, assignments, transfers, and designations in the postal field service, to revise the laws governing the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7775. A bill to amend section 212 (a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7776. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish a rural electrification loan account, to provide for an insured loan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 7777. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7778. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside in-

come which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 7779. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 7780. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7781. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 7782. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 7783. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent across-the-board benefit increase with an \$80 minimum (\$100 for 25 or more years of coverage) and subsequent cost-of-living increases, to provide benefits for certain disabled widows under age 60, to provide optional coverage for certain Federal employees, to liberalize the retirement test, to provide for increases in the amount of covered earnings to reflect general earnings level increases, and for other purposes, with the cost of these changes (other than the 8-percent benefit increase) being financed out of the general revenues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 7784. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 7785. A bill relating to the status of volunteer firemen's organizations for purposes of liability for Federal income taxes and reports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 7786. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 7787. A bill to include fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of lambs and swine, sausages, prepared or preserved pork, and prepared or preserved beef and veal within the quotas imposed on the importation of certain other meat and meat products, to reduce the percentage applied to certain aggregate quantity estimations used, in part, to determine such quotas from 110 to 100 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7788. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7789. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 7790. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 7791. A bill to amend section 7701 of

the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 7792. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 7793. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 7794. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 7795. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 7796. A bill to establish a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON (by request):

H.R. 7797. A bill to provide authorizations from the highway safety and beauty trust fund to carry out the purposes of the highway safety and beautification programs under title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 7798. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in honor of Virgil I. Grissom, Edward H. White II, and Roger B. Chaffee; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7799. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 7800. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 7801. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to prevent increases in monthly social security insurance benefits from affecting eligibility for veterans' pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 7802. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1956, relating to the D.C. Transit System, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 7803. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7804. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the Eklutna project, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 7805. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the registrar the same perquisite and restrictions which are now applicable to permanent professors at West Point; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 7806. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize the immediate retirement without reduction in annuity of employees and Members of Congress upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

so that there could be a legislative record made on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a simple bill, which should go by under the procedure of the Consent Calendar and by unanimous consent.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] that if the gentleman desires a statement in regard to this bill I shall be glad to provide such a statement, since the gentleman has raised this question.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Armed Services, and especially the subcommittee which considered this legislation, held most thorough hearings thereon, the most thorough hearings which we have ever conducted since this subject matter has been under consideration by the committee.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of the merits of the bill. It is a matter that this bill is of sufficient importance to our country so that there should be some sort of legislative record made and it just should not slide by under a unanimous-consent request or under the Consent Calendar procedure.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PELLY. I yield further to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion and judgment that there have been ample records, hearings, and consideration of this matter in the committee.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that there are no ambiguities contained in the bill. I do not believe it is an extremely complex bill.

Mr. Speaker, this procedure only represents the question of getting to the consideration of a very important and a very urgently needed material, nickel, and getting that nickel out of the national stockpile and into the hands of industry that needs the materials most urgently for defense-rated orders.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only question involved in this bill, may I inform the distinguished gentleman from Washington. I wish those facts to be clearly established in the Record—that of the increments of nickel that would be disposed of under this procedure, almost 90 percent will be allocated for defense-rated orders.

Mr. Speaker, the defense industry needs this release from the stockpile at this time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beseech the gentleman and I plead with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] not to object to this bill at this time, because such action would only delay the consideration of the subject matter as covered by this bill, the release of nickel that is urgently needed by the defense industry.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] that the need of industry is not the purpose of the stockpile. Further,

it is my opinion that this request should be more fully justified than the very strong statement that the gentleman has just made.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is no doubt but what there is some merit to the bill.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Washington wishes to object to the bill, that is his privilege to do so. However, I would like to point out to the gentleman the fact that every aspect of this bill has been adequately considered; first, whether we could safely take this quantity of nickel out of the stockpile, a question upon which we have had abundant testimony in support of that point.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have great faith in the gentleman from Massachusetts and the committee on which he serves. However, I do know that there were two members of the gentleman's committee whose remarks indicated that they had some doubts about this legislation.

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes; and they are very able members of the Committee on Armed Services, but I do not believe that those gentlemen object to the consideration of this bill at this time.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who filed separate views on this legislation, I would like to state for the benefit of the Members of the House my reason for doing so. That reason was due to the fact that I have differing opinions as to the validity of the present stockpile objective from responsible parties other than the witnesses who testified before the Committee on Armed Services. And, Mr. Speaker, in order to serve my own conscience, I felt duty-bound to express my objection.

However, I want it quite clearly known and understood that I, in no manner, wish to impede the passage of this bill, and I have no intention of registering an objection to it today.

But I do feel very strongly that the stockpiling objectives are not being properly served, and I felt duty-bound to state my opinion of the bill. I have no intention of trying to stop the bill.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to impede passage of the bill either, but I certainly agree that if it is an important piece of legislation it can come up under some other procedure within 2 or 3 days.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts be agreeable to my making a unanimous consent request that this bill be put down for suspension of the rules on Wednesday of this week?

Mr. PHILBIN. That will be agreeable.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would say that would come on a rather unfortunate date as far as I am concerned. Being a mem-

ber of the subcommittee, I would prefer that it be brought up on Thursday, if that does not interfere with the legislative program already scheduled for Thursday.

Mr. PHILBIN. That would be agreeable.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be put over until Thursday of this week, and that the bill may be brought up under suspension of the rules, and that the Speaker may recognize any Member insofar as the calling up of this bill is concerned on this coming Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the bill will be passed over without prejudice.

This completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—H.R. 7796

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 7796, to establish a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes, and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

THE NEW JOHN W. McCORMACK SCHOOL IN BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many honors have come to our beloved Speaker in his long life of public service, during the many years that he has devoted himself without stint to his country, to this House, to his district, and to his constituents.

He was recently the recipient of the coveted Silver Helmet Award of that outstanding veterans organization, AM-VETS, for his years of achievement in Congress. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts observed JOHN W. McCORMACK Day on March 16 of last year. On that occasion he returned to the Great and General Court of Massachusetts where his distinguished career had begun 46 years before, and addressed a joint session of the body he once had served as a representative from South Boston. He told his friends, his State's legislators, how moved he was by the honor which they had accorded him. He

ters of interest to you and to this administration at this small, informal gathering."

The reception was made known by someone in attendance who asked that his name be withheld. He said it was his belief that the party improperly used the office of the transportation secretary to seek political support for the President from a government-regulated industry.

The source said the list of guests included representatives of shippers, truckers and airlines, most of whom lobby for their interests in Congress.

Boyd and Criswell said in interviews that there was nothing improper in the reception. Criswell said the reception was not arranged for representatives of the transportation industry but for a "cross section" of people who had contributed to the party in the past, both Democrats and Republicans.

The source declined to provide a list of those attending, saying he did not want to embarrass them.

According to the source, about 40 persons attended. Invitations were checked at the door. Boyd, who arrived after a cocktail party was under way, had one drink and chatted.

He then gave a brief talk, describing how well off the country was under Mr. Johnson and saying that the country needed the President four years more. The source said his understanding of the speech was that it was framed for transportation industry.

Boyd left immediately after the talk, almost abruptly, the source thought.

Criswell spoke next, reciting the party's past financial troubles. He said the financial picture was looking up, but he was concerned that contributors might get the idea that there were no money problems remaining.

He then suggested that those present buy tickets to the dinner. The President would not only be at the dinner, the audience was told, but would stay and dance.

No attempt was made to sell tickets at the meeting. The informant said most of those attending could not afford to buy tickets themselves and presumably were expected to pass word to their corporate officers.

Under the Corrupt Practices Act, corporations are forbidden to make political contributions, but it is a common practice for businesses to do so through individuals.

When Boyd learned that word of his appearance at the Georgetown reception was to be published, he invited a reporter to his office and said he would be glad to answer any questions.

"I am glad to do anything I can honestly and ethically to help Lyndon Johnson," he said. "I knew this speech was endorsed and encouraged by the Democratic National Committee. I was asked to talk about our programs and urge support for the President."

He said he had been a Democrat all his life, but never in his government career had he given anyone an advantage because of political affiliation or activity.

He stressed that no plea for funds was made in his presence and that he expected never to know who at the meeting made a party contribution and who did not.

Had the White House suggested that he make such appearances?

"Absolutely not," Boyd replied. "I bet Lyndon Johnson never had any idea that the meeting was being held."

THE PHONY WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, we have been deluged by propaganda from the Office of Economic Opportunity advertising the accomplish-

ments of the phony war on poverty, but I believe that most of the Members of this House have not been fooled. The plain truth is that the so-called war against poverty is a well-heeled gravy train for agitators, black power advocates, and Communists. Many Members have already given this House examples of how the antipoverty program has been a gold mine for radicals and black power revolutionaries, so that today I would like to present an example of Communist infiltration of the war against poverty—specifically in New York City.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, one of the major components of New York City's antipoverty program—the work experience program of the Neighborhood Youth Corps—is headed by a man named Robert Schrank, who in 1962 was cited as a card-carrying Communist by then Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. It is not hard to understand why the Communists are interested in the work experience program. Mr. Schrank has bragged that it is the "fifth biggest employer in the city" because it has employed 40,000 young New Yorkers at \$1.50 an hour. Extremist groups, whether they be Fascist, Communist, or otherwise, have always shown a great preoccupation with gaining control over the thought processes of young people. No doubt the Communists are happy to have one of their men in charge of New York City's neighborhood youth program.

Let me briefly describe Mr. Schrank's record of subversion. During the late 1940's, he was an official of the International Association of Machinists, but he was expelled from the union in 1948 for parroting the Communist line. The Machinists, like most American labor unions, have an excellent record of cleaning out subversives the moment they show themselves. I wish we could say the same for the antipoverty program, where coddling of leftwingers has been made into an ideology.

In 1952, according to the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Mr. Schrank was the chairman of a conference held in New York City to repeal the Smith Act. He was then employed as an international representative of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union, which had been expelled by the AFL-CIO in 1950 as a Communist-dominated front. By this time, it was apparent that Mr. Schrank was a hardcore Communist sympathizer—and presumably a card-carrying Communist. He stayed with the International Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers until 1955, at which time House Un-American Activities Committee records lose track of him.

Later in 1962, Mr. Schrank was listed among those former officials of the International Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union who were shown to have been members of the Communist Party. He was so cited by the Federal Subversive Activities Control Board in 1962. The case in question is *Kennedy v. International Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers*, May 4, 1962, Docket No. 116-56.

In July 1966 Mr. Schrank was hired as director of work experience for the New York City Neighborhood Youth Corps. He has received several salary

hikes, and is now a full-fledged overpaid poverty commissar to the tune of \$20,500 a year.

I find it incredible that a Communist could have been picked to run New York City's youth program. After all, Mr. Schrank's record is public knowledge, and Mayor Lindsay certainly should have looked into Mr. Schrank's background before giving him charge of the 40,000 young New Yorkers. I regret to say that the mayor is guilty of rather woeful negligence or a great error of judgment. Maybe the mayor thinks that extremism is a virtue. It was only a few months ago that he went for a plane ride with a Black Muslim group called the "Five-Percenters" who think that the other 95 percent of Negroes have sold out to whitey. Maybe it is all part of "fun city."

But if the mayor thinks it is a joke to hire a Communist to run the city's youth program, I think that the people and parents of New York will be somewhat less amused.

Right now, \$14.5 million worth of Federal funds are flowing into New York City's Neighborhood Youth Corps. Another \$1.3 million is coming from the city. This certainly is not a program which should be supported by Federal funds so long as planning and programming are in the hands of a Communist.

Therefore, I hope that Sargent Shriver will take steps to cut off all Federal funds to the New York City Neighborhood Youth program until Mayor Lindsay eliminates all Communists who may presently be in leadership positions.

I agree with the basic program concept of providing employment to poor New York City teenagers, and I do not have and desire to terminate this program, but I do feel very strongly that it should not be a payroll for radicals and Communists. Until a thorough cleanup is made, I will do my best to cut off Federal funds. It is one thing to provide Federal funds to help young people. It is another to provide Federal funds to help Communists poison the minds of young people.

CREATION OF A COUNCIL OF ECOLOGICAL ADVISERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, America has been blessed with abundant resources. Together, all of our resources comprise the basis of the environment of the wealthiest nation on earth. Until this century, our Nation was primarily occupied with the development of most of those resources—with the mining and processing of mineral deposits; the planting and harvesting of the land; the cutting and milling of timber; the transport and industrial uses of water, and the mining, drilling, processing, and combustion of fossil fuels. In the early part of the 20th century, conservation of some of the overexploited resources of our country became a national interest. The Government began to take steps against the misuse of our most precious

national wealth next to our people, the natural resources of America. Characteristically, conservation was first concerned with the most obvious blemishes resulting from earlier misuse—denuded timberland, eroded farmland, very inefficient and wasteful mining and processing operations, and eventually, polluted and poisoned waterways.

Mr. Speaker, in the past two decades the concern over the resources of our environment has grown immensely. Not only are we concerned with the use and misuse of our resources, we are now concerned with the impact and effect of that use and misuse throughout our environment. Man and nature have altered our environment, and in doing so, have altered the ecology of our Nation—the interrelationship and interaction of all parts of our environment. We are no longer concerned just with the misuse of mineral deposits and its impact on the land; we are also concerned with the poisoned waters resulting from poor mine drainage. We are no longer concerned just with the agricultural problems which result from the misuse that created the great midwestern dust bowl; we are also concerned with the effects of the dust in the atmosphere and the air breathed by millions of people in those agricultural States. We are no longer concerned just with the inefficiency and waste of poor smelting and metal processing; we are concerned with the impact of poisonous air emissions on the lungs and lives of millions of urban and rural dwellers.

We have not yet dealt with these problems effectively. We have not even considered all of the problems besetting our environment and their effect on our ecology. We have a tendency, Mr. Speaker, to deal with problems in a piecemeal manner. We do not anticipate a problem in a so-called preventive fashion. Rather, we let problems reach a point where we must try to cope with them in order to keep them from getting even more out of hand. This certainly has been the case in the area of environmental quality control.

The Congress, State and local governments, and industries have only recently begun to show their concern and awareness of the problems of air and water pollution in the face of the ever-increasing outcry of public dissatisfaction. We have, however, continued to act in our manner of responding to problems once they have become large enough to attract national attention. We have been caught ill prepared to deal with these problems, and the indecisiveness of our legislation is indicative of our lack of foresight. While we are presently looking at the two giants in the area of environmental quality control, air and water pollution, we are not viewing them in a sophisticated enough manner, nor are we paying enough attention to their impact on each other and on the entire environment. We are not giving enough consideration to other problems which will increase with our national growth if they continue to go on unchecked.

We have a need to look after the entire environment and the ecology of that environment. We must know the relation-

ship of air to water pollution, and of each to solid waste matter, and of all to each other. We must understand the effects of radiation on all forms of pollution, the effects of pollution on the weather, the relationship of topography to pollution, and the beneficial combinations of urban planning to topography and the relationship of that combination to pollution abatement. We must understand the impact of environmental change on human beings, and how the changes in the quality of the atmosphere and the appearance of the environment affect man both physiologically and psychologically.

Mr. Speaker, we have a need to understand our physical surroundings and the ecology of that environment better, so that we may direct our efforts at beneficially altering our environment, and so that we may be able to foresee future problems that could be averted at an early stage. We must have an overview of our surroundings so that we can understand our strengths, weaknesses, and needs, and act accordingly.

At present we are dealing with many of the problems of our environment in many areas of the Government. I do not question that each of these areas has a special and particular interest in its area of authority. The Public Health Service, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, certainly has appropriate interest in air pollution, for air pollution has direct effects on our health. However, the Department of Transportation also has an interest in air pollution as it relates to automobiles and their ability to create air pollution, and as it relates to decreased atmospheric visibility which affects air transportation. Commerce has obvious interests when one of the great sources of air pollution is industry, and Agriculture is keenly interested in the impact of polluted air on crops and vegetation. I do not deny that each of these departments has a specialized and necessary interest in air pollution.

The Department of Interior has an important concern with water pollution, for it has jurisdiction over the billions of gallons of water which come from areas of Interior's jurisdiction. The Department of Housing and Urban Development also has an intense interest in water use, for it must concern itself with the water needs, and water and sewage systems of the great cities. Agricultural use of high quality water is a need that speaks for itself. Industrial use of water again involves Commerce, and there are obvious health needs in water purification systems. Again, I maintain that these areas all have individual legitimate and necessary authority in these realms.

The Atomic Energy Commission has obvious authority in the area of radioactive materials. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has interests in the health aspects of these potentially harmful materials. The Department of Defense has needs for nuclear fuels, and every Department involved with water which is interested in desalinization as a source of additional fresh water has considered atomic

facilities for such processes. These interests each have certain special concerns, and I feel that they are rightfully exercising authority in their own particular areas.

I could go on and on, but certainly it is not necessary. There is nothing wrong with this departmental specialization in related fields; it is advantageous for the Government to look at problems from a variety of specialized points of view. There are, however, some major needs which are not being met.

First and foremost is the need to view the entire environment and its total ecological interaction. It is essential to relate all of these areas of interest to each other. The environment is certainly composed of many more elements than have been mentioned here, and the ecology of the environment—the interaction of all of those elements—is something that I could not entirely explain here for we do not yet entirely understand it. That is my point. The understanding of our ecology is essential if we hope to successfully deal with the many problems of our environment. The understanding of our ecology is essential if we hope to create programs that will alleviate our environmental problems, both now and in the future. The understanding of our ecology is essential if we are to make the various individual programs in our Government relate effectively to one another, and to advance our activities in the realm of improving the entire environment. An effective overall view of the environment and its ecology will enable us to evaluate the effectiveness of our present efforts throughout the Government.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to introduce the Ecological Advisers Act of 1967. This bill proposes the creation of a Council of Ecological Advisers in the Executive Office of the President.

The purposes of this Council are manifold. Primarily this branch of the Executive Office is to provide an overview of the problems of the ecology of the national environment, and to recommend and develop ideas and concepts for the implementation of programs designed to improve, protect, reclaim, restore and conserve the various aspects of our environment. The Council is to establish devices for reviewing the effectiveness of, and the need for, programs throughout the Federal Government, or sponsored or supported by the Federal Government, in related areas of environmental or ecological quality.

The most important of the Council's tasks will be the relating of the various areas of environmental interest to each other, and the development of creative concepts and plans for the continual improvement of the ecological and environmental conditions of the Nation.

The Council is also to direct the coordination of the efforts throughout the Government by its appraisal of programs. Through its staff and research facilities, it is to streamline and coordinate the research activities of the various areas of Federal interest and involvement in ecological questions. The Council will also advise the President on the allo-

cation of funds for the various Federal areas involved with environmental questions.

The overview of the Council will be directed at the entire ecology of the environment—from the point of view of man and his needs. Ecology itself is not a concept which directs itself toward the effect of the interaction of the elements of the environment on one individual organism or element. However, in the case of the Council, we are interested in the environment and its ecology as it relates to man. The Council should not occupy itself with the narrow definition of each constituent element of the environment, but rather with the overall interaction of the constituent elements as they relate to man through their interaction with each other and with man. The Council, in short, must take a larger and not a smaller view of the picture of the environment. It must take a creative and comprehensive look at the ecology of our environment, concerning itself not only with the physical implications of the environment, but with the psychological and sociological implications of the conditions and interactions of the ecology of the environment on man. This will certainly include both the man-made as well as the natural elements of the environment.

The need for such a Council is clear. I have been in contact with representatives from industry, Federal departments, the executive offices, and scientific specialists, and they all express the idea that, in one form or another, some type of overseeing body is necessary to deal with the ever-increasing and continually proliferating questions and areas of authority concerned with our environment. They all affirm that an ecological view is necessary. There is a need to develop a long-range view of the problem, and corresponding long-range plans. There is a need to see that those areas of the Government dealing with various environmental problems are able to bring all resources to bear on those problems, are using all of the material available to the Federal Government, are not duplicating other efforts and programs, and are far reaching and creative in their efforts—with an understanding of the relationship of their projects and work to other related undertakings other places in the public and private realms.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to ask questions concerning the placement of such a council at the level of the Executive Office of the President. Once the need for such a body was determined, careful consideration was given for the placement of such an overseeing policy body. During the course of deliberations, the places considered for such a governmental function varied from a new Cabinet-level Department to an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It has become increasingly clear that a body created to deal with the entire environmental ecology must be in a commanding place in the Government if it is to be in any position to get an effective overview of national efforts and is to be a far-reaching policy determiner. If it is to be such an overseeing body, it cannot be placed in the structure of any one

department involved in any one area of ecological or environmental quality control. It could never oversee nor direct the efforts of activities in other departments equal in stature to the department in which it was a subdivision. Therefore, creating an Assistant Secretary, or some such similar position in an existing agency would essentially be impractical and make such a body or position impotent.

On the other hand, there is no desire to create a superdepartment—a department to collect all of the various environmental quality research and control functions rooted throughout the various agencies and departments. As stated earlier, there are certain specific areas which are best kept where they now are, and such a massive reorganization would only postpone further the needed advances in this field.

The logical place for this Council, therefore, is at the level of the Executive. There, as a result of its position and its composition, and through its contact with the President, it is in a position to direct and enhance the activities in the Federal interests in environmental quality control, and to exercise independent and creative judgment in a previously much neglected field.

The power of this Council is derived from a number of areas. First and foremost is the position of the Council in the Executive Offices of the President. The ecological advisers should be the executive equivalent of the Council of Economic Advisers, and through their function of reporting directly to the Executive on a regular and frequent basis, and recommending policy, programs and allocations, the advisers maintain a prominent and powerful position in the Government.

The composition of the body also lends itself to authority both within and outside of the Federal structure. The prestige value of a membership composed of experts and outstanding figures from a number of areas of private service should enable the Council to wield a great deal of influence in areas of environmental concern. The arrangement within the Council which enables the advisers to serve on the Council without leaving their important positions in public and private life, enables each individual member of the Council to maintain and enhance his own individual position of status in his area of specialty and influence.

The composition of the Council should be designed to include representatives of science, industry, and areas that are major concerns of environmental quality. The advisers themselves should be individuals who are capable of taking an effective overview of the situation, and not becoming involved with the particulars of the various programs which come under the purview of the authority of the Council. For this reason I feel that the larger part of the Council membership be composed of social scientists, social and community planners, and public administrators. The great volume of the needed scientific expertise should come from the staff of the Council which will serve on a full-time basis. As previously mentioned, the Council members will re-

tain their positions in public or private organizations in order to maintain positions of authority, and to help the member to maintain his specialized expertise and thus contribute more to the Council.

There is one additional underlying question which must be answered. This question deals with the concept of creating a new structure within the Government each time a problem is recognized. Should we create some new bureaucracy every time we discover or redefine a problem? Of course we should not in every case, or even in most cases, for we surely have the facilities within our gigantic Federal structure to handle most problems. This question can honestly be asked of any new proposal, and it certainly must be asked of a proposal of such far-reaching proportions as the one I am discussing today.

In the case of this plan I have proposed, I believe wholeheartedly that the need for its creation is clear. Our environment is our most immediate need; it affects us every minute of every day, and the ecology of that environment can alter our lives. This is not a simple problem, and therefore cannot be met by a simple solution. This is a problem that has roots throughout our country, and is dealt with in almost every area of the Federal Government. It is an area which includes environmental elements which must be actively related to each other if any valuable headway is to be made in the field of environmental quality control.

The possibilities of such a plan are very encouraging. The purview of the Council will deal not only with the interrelationship of the elements of the environment, but with the effects of those interrelationships on man himself. Only a Council in such a commanding position could be capable of collecting related information, coordinating efforts and projects, streamlining Federal activities in this rapidly growing field of interest, and developing the long-range and creative plans involving all areas of the Government which are necessarily involved in this realm.

Only a council such as the one proposed could have the latitude to develop such new concepts as the psychological implications of life in an urban area in terms of total ecology, and only such a council could be in a position to promote now unknown projects and concepts which are certain to develop in areas of urban and rural social ecology, and total concepts of waste disposal and related pollution abatement projects.

The need for such action is obvious. The problems of this country are increasing daily in this field, and we must stop dealing with them only as they appear as blemishes on the national countenance. We must be far reaching in our own efforts to establish a body with needed authority to view an immense problem from a comprehensive position and to develop effective solutions to complex and important problems.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I will submit this bill, and I commend it to the careful consideration of the Congress.

flatware; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 13206. A bill to develop business and employment opportunities in smaller cities and areas of unemployment and underemployment by providing certain preferences for prospective Government contractors in such cities and areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 13207. A bill to amend the act of November 8, 1965, relating to liability for civil damages as a result of acts or omissions at the scene of an accident; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 13208. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD (for himself, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. HULL, and Mr. WALKER):

H.R. 13209. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and furnish financial and other assistance to States and other public bodies and organizations in establishing a system for the prevention, control, and suppression of fires in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 13210. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13211. A bill to create in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Ecological Advisers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. UTT (for himself, Mr. BOB WILSON and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 13212. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 13213. A bill to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, to provide for a national program of flood insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13214. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 13215. A bill to amend section 1072(2) (F) of title 10, United States Code, to include other than natural parents and parents-in-law within the category of dependents eligible for medical care; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 13216. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13217. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$200 million for a U.S. contribution to multilateral special funds of the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13218. A bill to extend the tariff quota treatment for certain stainless steel table flatware; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 13219. A bill to amend the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act with respect to the labeling of packages of cigarettes and for other purposes; and to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the broadcasting of advertisements for tobacco products during certain periods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VIGORITO (for himself and Mr. BRASCO):

H.R. 13220. A bill to amend the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act with respect to the labeling of packages of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 13221. A bill to amend the act of December 21, 1944, relating to the City of Clinton Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERLONG (for himself, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. UTT, and Mr. COLLIER):

H.R. 13222. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the temporary rate of duty for color television picture tubes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 13223. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 13224. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 13225. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. MAILLARD, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon,

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. DOW, Mr. KARTH, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PELLY, Mr. KEITH, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. DELLENBACK):

H.J. Res. 854. Joint resolution to provide for a study of the resources of the ocean floor by the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and to prevent certain premature actions which might adversely affect the interests of the United States in such resources; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALL:

H.J. Res. 855. Joint resolution to provide for a study of the resources of the ocean floor by the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and to prevent certain premature actions which might adversely affect the interests of the United States in such resources; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.J. Res. 856. Joint resolution in opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOSHER (for himself, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BYRNE

of Pennsylvania, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. GROVER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. BUTTON):

H.J. Res. 857. Joint resolution to provide for a study of the resources of the ocean floor by the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and to prevent certain premature actions which might adversely affect the interests of the United States in such resources; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 858. Joint resolution amending title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to guarantee certain loans made to the National Maritime Historical Society for the purpose

of restoring and returning to the United States the last surviving American square-rigged merchant ship, the *Kaiulani*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. BARRETT):

H.J. Res. 859. Joint resolution extending for 1 year the emergency provisions of the urban mass transportation program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YATES:

H.J. Res. 860. Joint resolution authorizing participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Con. Res. 514. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session to hear a former Vietcong prisoner of war; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H. Res. 935. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to set aside a portion of the gallery for the use of scholars engaged in studies of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa (for himself,

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. MORRIS, Mr. SLACK, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. HUNGATE):

H. Res. 936. Resolution creating a select committee to study the impact of East-West trade and assistance to nations which support aggression, directly or indirectly; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ADAIR (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. PELLY, Mr. LUKENS, and Mr. GOODLING):

H. Res. 937. Resolution creating a select committee to study the impact of East-West trade and assistance to nations which support aggression, directly or indirectly; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 13226. A bill for the relief of Isaac, Berta, and Chaya Eichenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13227. A bill to fix date of citizenship of Alfred Lorman for purposes of War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 13228. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Hennessey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 13229. A bill for the relief of Clemente F. Astudillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 13230. A bill for the relief of Thomas K. Lomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13231. A bill for the relief of Ashwani Kumar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 13232. A bill for the relief of David L. Blair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 13233. A bill for the relief of Nemesio Gomez-Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 13234. A bill for the relief of Mauro Zaino and his wife, Maria Zaino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13235. A bill for the relief of Oscar Esparza and his wife, Lydia Esparza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13236. A bill for the relief of Filippo Villano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

of the United States jurisdiction to resolve controversy with respect to jurisdiction to regulate a public utility and to provide for venue in such cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYNDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2789. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research, study and surveys, documentation, and description of the natural environmental systems of the United States for the purpose of understanding and evaluating the condition of these systems and to provide information to those concerned with natural resources management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. HART):

S. 2790. A bill to amend section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HART, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and Mr. MOSS):

S.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the existing compensation system for motor vehicle accident losses and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

STUDY OF THE FEASIBILITY OF USING WATER FROM THE MISSOURI RIVER IN WESTERN TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, at the recent annual meeting of the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association in Omaha, Nebr., on December 8, 1967, there was presented by R. W. Beck & Associates, analytical and consulting engineers, a plan for the use of the waters of the Missouri River by the Great Plains area, which includes much of the western part of the State of Texas. I think that this plan is most significant, and I call it to the attention of the Senate.

Its main point is that many areas in the Missouri River Basin have a surplus of water, while many other areas, that are contiguous with the basin, have a definite shortage. These shortages could be corrected by diverting water from the Missouri into the areas of shortage, still leaving plenty of water for the programed growth of all areas.

This proposal has foresight and vision. The water problem has long been one of the most serious in the Great Plains area, where the soil is so naturally rich and fertile, yet where little will grow in proportion to its potential, because of insufficient water supply. We lose much of our agricultural and industrial capability by not opening up these areas with water from areas of great surplus.

Quoting from the study:

As our water requirements increase, it is not realistic to permit water unused and unuseable in one area to go to waste when it can be transported and used in another area to enhance the nation's economy. A haunting memory to the Great Plains area is the drought of the Thirties, when a shortage of water supply resulted in untold economic loss and misery.

It is imperative that we act to prevent this from ever happening again, especially when the means are so near our grasp. The existing Texas water plan has recognized the fact that there is not enough water readily available for the western part of our State, and that the only sources that are feasible are at a great distance from the State. It is realized also that water will have to be transported from other areas to fill the requirements.

It is the contention of the study by R. W. Beck & Associates that the Missouri River Basin offers the best promise as a source of water for West Texas and I am inclined to agree with them.

The annual waterflow of the Missouri at Sioux City, Iowa, during the period from 1898 to 1962 was 33,400 cubic feet per second which was about 1½ times the flow of the Colorado, which serves California and Arizona. Thus there seems to be plenty of water to divert from one area to the other without endangering anyone's growth. As a fact of life, the western part of Texas, as well as other Great Plain's areas must have an increased water supply, and this could be the answer.

Under the proposed plan of development flows of the Missouri River would be diverted just downstream from Fort Randall Reservoir at an elevation of approximately 1,250 feet above sea level. The flows would be lifted through a series of dams and/or canals 200 miles up the Niobrara River in Nebraska to approximately elevation 4,050 feet above sea level at a point just north of Alliance, Nebr.

From there, the entire project water would flow by gravity in a major canal running almost due south through western Nebraska, crossing the North Platte River and passing between Sidney and Chappel, Nebr.; thence into eastern Colorado, crossing the South Platte River above Julesburg, Frenchman Creek above Holyoke, Colo., the South Fork of the Republican River and crossing into western Kansas above Goodland; thence generally along the Colorado-Kansas border crossing the Smokey Hill River to about Tribune, Kans., where the canal would swing back west to cross the Arkansas River below Lamar, Colo.; thence south to cross the Cimarron River below Boise City, Okla., the North Canadian River near the Oklahoma-Texas border, the Canadian River north and west of Amarillo, Tex.; thence south, crossing the Prairie Dog Town Fork of the Red River south of Amarillo and swinging slightly south and west through the high plains of west Texas crossing the upper reaches of the Brazos River above Lubbock, the Colorado River near the border of New Mexico and finally terminating at elevation 3,660 near Hobbs, N. Mex.

A small extension of the main canal

could deliver water by gravity to the Pecos River near Carlsbad, N. Mex., and the remainder would flow in natural channels south to the Pecos River below Pecos, Tex.

Water delivered to the Pecos River could flow downstream through a potential power project south of Midland, Tex., where approximately 650 feet of head for conventional and pumped storage power development could be utilized before the water finally flows into the Rio Grande River above the Amistad project.

The diversion of a substantial amount of the flows of the Missouri River as here proposed will have no detrimental effect on any existing or proposed water resource developments in the Upper Basin.

Downstream water quality control on the Missouri River is assured in that at least 3 million acre-feet per year is planned for release below Sioux City for pollution abatement and municipal water supply requirements. This requirement was determined for the Corps of Engineers mainstem operation studies as being adequate with essentially untreated sewage being placed in the Missouri River at Omaha and other major population centers.

Desirable as this transfer is in theory, much planning and study is necessary before it can be carried out. The needs of the areas containing the surplus water must be taken into account, as well as how to parcel the water that is deemed available.

In order to answer these and many other questions raised, I introduce for appropriate reference a measure which would direct a study of the feasibility of diverting water from the Missouri River to areas, such as the western part of Texas, where the need is so great. I hope that the Senate will expeditiously consider this matter so that the planning for this great and urgent task may get underway.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a summary of the major features of this proposed project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred to; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2779) to provide for an investigation and study of the feasibility of diverting water from the Missouri River to the western part of the State of Texas, introduced by Mr. Tower, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The summary, presented by Mr. Tower, is as follows:

A NEW WATER RESOURCE PLAN FOR THE GREAT PLAINS MAJOR PROJECT FEATURES

WATER SUPPLY

1. Source: Missouri River below Fort Randall Reservoir.

2. Availability At Point of Diversion: 13,000,000 Acre-Ft. avg. annual; 9,000,000 Acre-Ft. minimum; 16,000,000 Acre-Ft. maximum.

Delivered to Participating Projects: 10,200,000 Acre-Ft. avg. annual.

3. Means of Diversion & Transportation Pumping: Reversible turbines and pumps located at dams and/or canals along the length of the Niobrara River from the mouth

are concerned, except as to widows during widowhood, payments may be made only to those persons who qualify as dependents at the time the claim is filed.

Grants to States

Under plans approved by the Secretary, subject to certain specified standards, the Secretary may make grants to the States in which uranium mining is carried on to conduct studies and to carry out other programs to improve workmen's compensation benefit programs as they relate to ionizing radiation in employment in uranium mines.

Miscellaneous

The Secretary is given power to make rules for the administration of the Act including the specifying of the degree of proof necessary to establish compensability of claims for benefits when State workmen's compensation benefits are not available. Consultations will be made as appropriate, respecting proposed rules with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Departments of Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Benefits authorized under this proposal will be paid from the Employees' Compensation Fund established by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 14, 1967]

WIRTZ URGES BILL FOR URANIUM MINERS

(By J. V. Reistrug)

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz sent Congress a bill yesterday to provide compensation for uranium miners who contract cancer as a result of radiation in the mines.

"This past year the Nation became aware of the tragic cases of lung cancer contracted by uranium miners in the course of their work," Wirtz said in a letter accompanying the bill.

"This awareness was followed by immediate steps to assure that radiation hazards in uranium mines would be reduced. A safety program, however, only protects workers in the future—it does not correct the past. What is left undone is the assurance that these miners and their families will be adequately compensated for their losses."

Lung cancer, generally fatal in a matter of months, shows up as much as 20 years after the first exposure to excessive radiation in the mines. More than 100 miners have already died of the disease and one highly controversial estimate is of more than 1000 deaths by 1985.

Of the principal uranium states—New Mexico, Wyoming, Colorado and Utah—only Colorado has recognized lung cancer as an occupational disease among uranium miners and Colorado officials have voiced concern that their compensation fund might go broke.

The Utah Supreme Court recently upheld that State's Compensation Board in denying the claim of Mrs. Douglas Garner, widow of a uranium miner, for compensation in a test case.

Despite a body of scientific literature dating back to the 1950s, no Federal authority has been exercised regarding either regulation of the mines or compensation of their victims until articles dealing with miners appeared in the press this year.

In May Wirtz invoked his authority under a depression era law to set safety standards for mines whose production is bought by the Federal Government. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy began a series of hearings.

In July the inter-agency Federal Radiation Council, which had been studying the problem for two years, reached agreement on a standard that apparently will be the one enforced by Interior Department's Bureau of Mines in mines that sell their output to electric-power companies in the future.

The Labor Department's delay in producing a compensation bill is understood to stem in part from the need to reach agreement

among the Government agencies with an interest in the problem.

In the meantime, compensation bills were introduced by Senators from the states affected—in each case with the comment that the measures were not offered as a final version but were aimed at spurring action.

The Wirtz bill, which has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, covers lung cancer cases arising from radiation exposure between the start of Government buying in 1948 and five years after the bill's enactment.

By that time, Wirtz said in the letter, the hazards in the mines should be reduced and the state's compensation laws should be updated.

It would authorize compensation payments to disabled miners, or their widows and orphans, up to the level of amounts provided in the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act—one of the Federal Government's rare excursions into the compensation field generally left to the states.

Coupled with proposed amendments to the Longshoremen's Act, the new Wirtz proposal would provide a maximum of \$105 a week to a dying miner and up to 75 per cent of that to a miner's widow with two or more dependent children.

The Federal payments would supplement state benefits or substitute for them if they are lacking.

The bill also would provide grants to the states to support studies and plans to update their workmen's compensation programs in the field.

PUBLIC UTILITY JURISDICTION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at the request of the American Bar Association, I am today introducing a bill to grant to the district courts of the United States jurisdiction to resolve controversies relating to jurisdiction to regulate a public utility. The bill also specifies rules of venue in such controversies.

The bill would, in effect, make the U.S. district courts the arbiters in the first instance of all controversies between two or more States or their agencies, or between the United States or one or more agencies of the United States, on the one hand, and one or more States or State agencies, on the other hand, respecting jurisdiction to regulate a public utility. It has been reported that many public utilities are caught in the crossfire of conflicting claims of jurisdiction to regulate them by two or more agencies of different States, or by one or more State agencies and one or more Federal agencies. Those who complain of this precarious "crossfire" situation also complain that, often, their only recourse is costly and protracted engagement in two or more parallel courses of litigation, in the courts of two or more States, or of one or more States and of the United States.

Mr. President, while I have come to no conclusion regarding the merits of this bill, I do feel that the area is an appropriate one for congressional study, and I am hopeful that the bill will be accorded careful consideration in this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2788) to grant the district courts of the United States jurisdiction to resolve controversy with respect to jurisdiction to regulate a public utility and to provide for venue in such cases, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read

twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ECOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND SURVEYS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, the ecological research and surveys bill, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research into our natural environmental systems.

Ecology—the study of the delicate relationships that bind all living creatures to one another and to their natural home, the relationships that make up the balance of nature—is fascinating and valuable for its own sake.

But to a society in which population and technology are pressing ever harder against a dwindling natural resource base a more precise understanding of ecology is vitally necessary. Land use and natural resource use decisions must be made. If they are to be made wisely, we must know more than we now do about ecology.

There is a great deal of concern today being expressed about the dramatic deterioration of our environment. It has now become painfully obvious that we must direct in the years ahead a great deal of time and effort not only toward cleaning up our dirty rivers, our polluted air, and our ravaged landscape but also toward avoiding further destruction of our resource base.

Our knowledge today of basic ecology is surprisingly sparse. This lack of information is becoming more and more critical. Basic ecological knowledge represents the building blocks with which we will be able to construct a livable environment in the years ahead.

The bill I am introducing today would take us in the direction we need to go. Very briefly, it would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to:

Conduct studies of natural environmental systems in the United States;

Establish a clearinghouse for information on ecological problems and studies and disseminate information about progress in the field;

Establish a program in which representative natural environments on Federal lands could be set aside for scientific study and assist and encourage the setting up of similar preserves on State and private lands; and

Participate with other governments and international bodies in environmental research.

The rapid rate of increase in population and pressure on the natural environment makes urgent the need for a great increase in ecological research. This bill will be a step in that direction. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2789) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research, study and surveys, documentation, and description of the natural environmental systems of the United

States for the purpose of understanding and evaluating the condition of these systems and to provide information to those concerned with natural resources management, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2789

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that as a result of population pressures, the development of transportation systems, agricultural practices, numerous natural resource developments, and other technological advances, the status of native plant and animal systems and their natural environment in the United States has changed markedly; that serious losses in valuable species of fauna and flora and gains in unwanted species have occurred and continue to occur; that valuable elements of natural communities have disappeared or have become so restricted in area and numbers that they may never recover; that many areas of outstanding interest, scientific value and scenic beauty have been protected but through lack of knowledge and inadequate management practices their value has been lost or has waned; that, in fact, this storm of modern change, in blighting and destroying what has been cherished for generations in this country, is degrading man's environment and threatens his very existence; that it is desirable that studies be conducted to describe, understand, and evaluate these natural and man-caused changes or trends in our natural environmental systems and to provide the information to the public or private agencies, or persons responsible for planning and developing our future resource projects. It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to authorize a comprehensive program of research, studies, and surveys in order to produce an understanding of our natural resources and the environmental forces responsible for their development and well-being and to provide a basis for the future protection, enhancement, and proper utilization of the natural environmental systems of the United States. It is not the purpose of this Act to encroach upon or otherwise restrict authorized Federal programs in the fields of agronomy, forest and range management, public health, flood control, wildlife management, or soil conservation other than as an advisory or coordinating activity.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), in order to carry out the purposes of this Act, is authorized—

(1) to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, research, and analyses;

(2) to document and define changes in the natural environment, including the plant and animal systems, and to accumulate necessary data and other information for a continuing analysis of these changes or trends and an interpretation of their underlying causes;

(3) to develop and maintain an inventory of natural resource development projects, engineering works, and other major projects such as, but not limited to, eradication projects contemplated or planned by public or private agencies or organizations which may make significant modifications in the natural environment;

(4) to establish a system of collecting and receiving information and data on ecological research and evaluations which are in progress or are planned by other public or private agencies or organizations, or individuals;

(5) to evaluate and disseminate information of an ecological nature to public and

private agencies or organizations, or individuals in the form of reports, publications, atlases, and maps;

(6) to initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource oriented projects;

(7) to encourage other public or private agencies planning development projects to consult with the Secretary on the impact of the proposed projects on the natural environment;

(8) to encourage and assist public (non-Federal) or private agencies or organizations, including educational institutions, museums, and botanical and zoological gardens and other scientific or conservation organizations, or individuals to acquire, designate, and maintain representative samples of important natural environmental systems, including natural areas for observation and for manipulation, and to encourage such agencies, organizations, and individuals to utilize existing areas under their control or jurisdiction for such purposes; and

(9) to establish through interagency coordination, on federally owned lands, a Federal system of natural areas for scientific purposes, and develop the means and methods for withdrawal of such areas from nonconforming uses, and provide for their management and protection to serve the natural research needs of all agencies, both public and private; except that in developing standards governing any such withdrawals, the Secretary shall give due consideration to future alternative uses of such areas subject to withdrawal.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is further authorized for the purposes of this Act (1) to make grants and enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with public or private agencies or organizations, or individuals, (2) to accept and use donations of funds, property, personal services, or facilities, (3) to acquire selected areas of lands or interests in lands by donation, acquisition with donated funds, devise, or exchange for acquired lands or public lands under his jurisdiction which he finds suitable for disposition, (4) to administer such lands or interests for experimental purposes, including the observation and manipulation of natural areas, and (5) to issue such regulations as he deems necessary with respect to the administration of such lands.

SEC. 4. Activities authorized by this Act may be carried out on lands under the jurisdiction or control of other departments or agencies of the Government only with the approval of the head of the department or agency concerned.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall consult with and provide technical assistance to departments and agencies of the Government, and he is authorized to obtain from such departments and agencies such information, data, reports, advice, and assistance as he deems necessary or appropriate and which can reasonably be furnished by such departments and agencies in carrying out the purposes of this Act. Any Federal agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement by the Secretary.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act is intended to give, or shall be construed as giving, the Secretary any authority over any of the authorized programs of any other department or agency of the Government, or as repealing, modifying, restricting, or amending existing authorities or responsibilities that any department or agency may have with respect to the natural environment. The Secretary shall consult with the heads of such departments and agencies for the purpose of identifying and eliminating duplication of effort.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary is authorized to establish such advisory committees as he deems desirable for the purpose of rendering advice and submitting recommendations to him relating to the carrying out of the pur-

poses of this Act. Such advisory committees shall render advice and submit recommendations to the Secretary upon his request and may submit recommendations to the Secretary at any time on their own initiative. The Secretary may designate employees of the Department of the Interior to serve as secretaries to the committees.

(b) Members of advisory committees appointed by the Secretary may receive not to exceed \$100 per day when engaged in the actual performance of their duties, in addition to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to participate in environmental research in surrounding oceans and in other countries in cooperation with appropriate departments or agencies of such countries or with coordinating international organizations if he determines that such activities will contribute to the objectives and purposes of this Act.

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF AN AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE INVESTIGATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators PASTORE, MONRONEY, LAUSCHE, BARTLETT, HARTKE, HART, CANNON, BREWSTER, LONG of Louisiana, and MOSS, a joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the existing compensation system for motor vehicle accident losses, and for other purposes. I am also pleased to note that Congressman JOHN MOSS, Democrat of California, is introducing this resolution in the House of Representatives today.

In this century, the automobile has become the indispensable mode of transportation. It has revolutionized the structure of our cities. And it has made it possible for all Americans—not just the rich—to move with freedom about the country in pursuit of both economic opportunity and pleasure.

Without question, then, the automobile is a striking example of social progress. Unfortunately, progress inevitably exacts its price: it spawns new social problems and complexities.

We have long known the benefits of the automobile as a mode of transportation. Only recently, however, has public attention been focused on the "social costs" associated with automobile driving.

The most tragic cost, of course, has been the soaring rate of accidental death and injury on the Nation's highways. The statistics are grim: 1.6 million dead since the coming of the automobile; over 50,000 to die this year. And, unless the accelerating spiral of death is arrested, 100,000 Americans will die from automobile-inflicted injuries by 1975. But these soaring rates are not inexorable; they are not acceptable; they can be reduced. During the last session of Congress, two major legislative measures were enacted which promise to minimize these tragic losses. The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 gave the Secretary of Transportation plenary authority to establish safety standards for all motor

to law, a proposed concession contract under which Arlington Hotel Co., Inc., will be authorized to continue to provide bathing facilities and related services for the registered guests of the Arlington Hotel in the city of Hot Springs, Ark., for a 5-year period from January 1, 1968, through December 31, 1972, when executed by the Director of the National Park Services; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration, and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to the granting of third preference and sixth preference classification to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1965 AND AFFORD THE SAME IMMIGRATION PRIVILEGES TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND THAT IS AFFORDED TO OTHER NATIONS

Whereas, The Irish immigrant played an important part in the early pioneering days of our great nation; and

Whereas, The Irish immigrants and their sons and daughters have contributed greatly and today are playing a leading role in all aspects of the business, social, military and political life of our country; and

Whereas, By the passage of the Immigration Act of 1965, Congress reduced the Irish immigration quota, when it provided that after July, 1968 no Irishman will be allowed to immigrate to this country unless he is a skilled worker, or has a family here which will guarantee his welfare; and

Whereas, Ireland is a young nation that needs her skilled workers but has a surplus of unskilled workers her economy cannot support; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to amend the Immigration Act of 1965 and make it possible for more unskilled workers of Ireland to immigrate to America; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from this Commonwealth.

REPORT ENTITLED "OPERATION OF ARTICLE VII, NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 946)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on October 12, 1967, the full Committee on Armed Services approved the annual report entitled "Operation of Article VII, NATO Status of Forces Treaty," together with other jurisdictional operations, for the period December 1, 1965, through November 30, 1966.

I submit to the Senate this report and ask that it be printed, with illustrations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:
Eleven postmaster nominations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2791. A bill for the relief of Wong Tat Ming, Yeung Sau Wing, Chiong Book, Kam Fat Wai, Chan Chun Lam, and Cheng Siu Shiu to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2792. A bill to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act in order to make certain facilities on which construction was begun after January 1, 1966, eligible for grants under part C of that act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2793. A bill to restrict the mailing of unsolicited credit cards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONDALE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a longer period of time for disposition of certain assets in the case of regulated investment companies furnishing capital to development companies; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

S. 2795. A bill for the relief of Ho Chi Keung and Tseng Kam Kuen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK (by request):

S. 2796. A bill to amend sections 2, 9, 8, and 10 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2797. A bill relating to the deduction for Federal income tax purposes of contributions to certain organizations promoting approval of State constitutional conventions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2798. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, in order to provide for a statutory payment of \$47 a month to a veteran who has lost the use of a lung or kidney as the result of a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2799. A bill for the relief of Santosh Kumar Nandy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2800. A bill to provide Rehabilitation Loans for city-owned property in deteriorating areas;

S. 2801. A bill to provide interest supplement payments for housing for low- and moderate-income families; and

S. 2802. A bill to allow State or local financed housing projects to be eligible for rent supplement recipients; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2803. A bill for the relief of Antonio Girardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2804. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of treble damage payments under the antitrust laws; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 2805. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct investigations, studies, surveys and research relating to the Nation's ecological systems, natural resources and environmental quality, and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2806. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 11, 1903 (ch. 544, 32 Stat. 823, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 29, 49 U.S.C. 45), commonly known as the Expediting Act;

S. 2807. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 11, 1903 (ch. 544, 32 Stat. 823, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 29, 49 U.S.C. 45), commonly known as the Expediting Act;

S. 2808. A bill to amend the act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act, and for other purposes;

S. 2809. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 11, 1903 (ch. 544, 32 Stat. 823, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 29, 49 U.S.C. 45), commonly known as the Expediting Act;

S. 2810. A bill to amend section 1 of the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, as amended;

S. 2811. A bill to amend the first section of the act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act, to exclude from the operation thereof actions arising under the Interstate Commerce Act; and

S. 2812. A bill to repeal the act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKE:

S. 2813. A bill for the relief of Manuel Soares De Medeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. FONG, Mr. PELL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 2814. A bill to establish in the Department of State a Bureau of Refugee, Migration, and Visa Affairs to be headed by an Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIER:

S. 2815. A bill to repeal the 25-percent gold cover requirement for Federal Reserve notes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina):

S. 2816. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1964 ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, ruling 64-224, on the deterrent against antitrust violations intended in section 4 of the Clayton Act? The ruling held that treble damages under section 4 were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses. This formal ruling was contrary to the informal rulings by the Commissioner theretofore. Many believed it was based on unsound reasoning. It grew out of approximately 2,000 treble damage suits filed as a result of the Department of Justice indicting in Philadelphia many manufacturers of electrical equipment.

One major problem, as I see it, is that this ruling removed much of the deterrent sting from section 4 of the Clayton Act. The amount of the punishment fixed by section 4 has been reduced by an amount measured by the income tax rate of the defendant.

The combined effect of ruling 64-224 and the Glenshaw Glass decision has been to transfer the tax burden on the penal part of antitrust treble damages from the law violator to the party injured by the violation.

Mr. President, the bill which I introduce now would restore section 4 to the full effect Congress intended. At the same time the bill seems equitable to both the plaintiff and the defendant.

The bill provides that compensation to a plaintiff for actual damages will be taxable as business income. The defendant would be allowed tax exemption on this amount as a business expense.

That portion which is not compensation—in most cases two-thirds—would not be considered income to the plaintiff. Instead the defendant would pay taxes on the two-thirds since it is punishment for violation of the antitrust laws. To exempt such payment from tax would frustrate sharply defined public policy against restraint of trade and monopoly.

We cannot overlook the fact that the law makes restraints of trade and monopolization a criminal offense as well as providing civil remedies. As fines paid for criminal violations are not deductible, neither should be amounts assessed by section 4 in private actions.

The first section of the bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that no deduction for income tax purposes should be allowed for two-thirds of any amount paid on any judgment entered against the taxpayer or in settlement of any action brought against him under section 4 of the Clayton Act.

The second section of the bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code by including in the items excluded from income two-thirds of any amount received on any judgment or in settlement of any action brought by the taxpayer under section 4 of the Clayton Act.

The bill would not be retroactive.

This legislation then would accomplish three things: it would encourage private antitrust enforcement; it would discourage antitrust violations; it would make clear that public policy does not favor law violations.

The American taxpayer is entitled to equal treatment in the administration of our tax laws. This bill would make clear congressional determination that he be

treated fairly by the Internal Revenue Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2804) relating to the income tax treatment of treble damage payments under the antitrust laws, introduced by Mr. Hart, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL PROGRAM ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from the State of California [Mr. KUCHEL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a national program on environmental quality control.

The purpose of this legislation is to lay the framework for a continuing program of research and study which will insure that present and future generations of Americans will be able to live in and enjoy an environment that is not fraught with hazards to mental and physical well-being.

Title I of the proposed legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, and research relating to the Nation's ecological systems, natural resources, and environmental quality.

Title II of the bill would establish a Council on Environmental Quality to study and analyze environmental trends; the factors that affect these trends; and how they relate to the conservation, social, economic, and health goals of the Nation. The Council would also advise and assist the President in the formulation of national policies to foster and promote the improvement of environmental quality, and in the preparation of the biennial environmental quality report required by section 203 of the bill.

It is clear, as we enter the last one-third of the 20th century, that a national policy on environmental quality management is needed. In a recent speech to the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs in Portland, Oreg., I noted:

Making rational decisions, profiting by past mistakes, and learning to anticipate future problems in the management of our environment becomes a matter of greater urgency because the pace of change in the world is quickening. The period of time between each new acquisition and application of scientific and technological power is growing successively shorter. The modified scale and scope of change is such that the world is altered as we walk in it. The years of a man's life no longer measure small growths and rearrangements. They measure instead a great upheaval of change. And too often these changes are not for the better.

I also quoted from an article by Max Ways which appeared in a past issue of *Fortune* magazine. Mr. Ways wrote:

Within a decade or two it will be generally understood that the main challenge to . . . society will turn not around the production of goods but around the difficulties and opportunities involved in a world of accelerating change and ever-widening choices . . . Trying to "make sense" of change will (soon) come to be our basic industry.

Esthetic and ethical values will be evolving along with the choices to which they will be applied. The question about progress will be "how good?" rather than "how much?"

The important point to be made is that there are alternatives. There are choices which can and must be made in the management of our natural resources and our environment. Environmental decay, whether in the form of a slow unobtrusive decline in the quality of our water, air, and surroundings or in the form of an industrial accident, is not an inevitable byproduct of industrial and technological progress. Today, in many areas, we are deeply engaged in trying to understand and manage our resources as a complex system of interrelated elements, rather than as separate parts. The headlong pace of development we are experiencing is beginning to force both the public and the private sectors to accept responsibilities and to adopt environmental quality policies that would have been unthinkable 10 years ago.

More, however, must be done if we are to have available the scientific and technical information necessary to make the sound and realistic decisions which will lead to a quality environment. Title I of this legislation provides the Secretary of the Interior with the authority to initiate a program which will develop much of this information. Title I also recognizes the legitimate roles of other departments and agencies of Government in developing related information.

This section of the bill represents a revised draft of legislation which was originally introduced by Senator NELSON in the 89th Congress as S. 2282—S. 2789 in the 90th Congress. Hearings on this measure, chaired by Senator NELSON, were held before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on April 27, 1966. These hearings are available and detail the need for an accelerated program of basic research, survey, and study of the ecological system of our Nation.

Choosing between the alternatives available to us will require that we develop intelligent long-range public policies on environmental quality and on the administration of the environment. While we have already made some significant progress toward this end, the movement of government from the role of arbitrator among conflicting resource interests to the role of trustee for the environment as a whole is still far from complete.

For too long government has reacted to environmental crises rather than anticipating and avoiding them. The future will require that more effort be spent on treating the causes, rather than the symptoms of environmental decay.

As many Members of the Senate are aware, a number of highly respected conservation organizations, research institutes, and scholars from universities all across the Nation have, over the past few years, proposed the creation of a Council of Advisers to assist and advise the President on the formulation, coordination and implementation of environmental quality goals and policies. Most recently, an article in the *Decem-*

ber 11, 1967, issue of Sports Illustrated by senior editor Robert H. Boyle, calls for the establishment of a National Council of Ecological Advisers.

A recent report by the Task Force on Environmental Health and Related Problems in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "A Strategy for a Livable Environment," made a similar recommendation.

Similar proposals have been voiced in speeches, articles, and in testimony before committees of the Congress by Mr. Russell F. Train, president of the Conservation Foundation; Dr. Howard R. Bowen, president of the University of Iowa, and chairman of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress; Dr. Lynton K. Caldwell, chairman of the department of government, Indiana University; staff members of the Hudson Institute; and many others.

The bill I am introducing today will give the Senate an opportunity to consider these various proposals and to determine the most appropriate means to insure that the environment available to the American people is a quality environment full of diverse opportunities.

Finally, section 23 of title II directs that the President shall transmit to the Congress a biennial environmental quality report which shall: First, set forth the status and condition of the major natural, manmade, and altered environmental classes of the Nation; and second, set forth the current and foreseeable trends in the quality, management, and utilization of these environments, and the affect these trends will have on the social and economic well-being of the Nation.

A comprehensive and coordinated report of this nature is needed to provide an overview of the many public and pri-

vate programs and activities now underway which have obvious—and often detrimental—impacts on environmental quality. At present, there is no single publication or report which even begins to disclose the impact which Federal programs have on environmental quality. Nor is there a publication which discloses the major environmental programs and studies the Federal Government is conducting or supporting. The span of these activities and the need for coordination of policies may be seen in a very incomplete chart published in the May 23, 1966, Journal of Chemistry and Engineering, at page 37.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this chart be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGURE 1.—MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND STUDIES SPAN, 18 SELECTED FEDERAL AGENCIES

	Pesticides	Solid waste disposal	Water quality (pollution)	Water resources	Land conservation	
Environmental Sciences Services Administration (Commerce).			Flow prediction.	Flow prediction.	Mapping.	
Geological Survey (Interior).	Waterborne.	Radioactive materials.	Measurement.	Primary mission.	Do.	
National Science Foundation.			Basic hydrology.			
Environmental Health Sciences Centers (HEW).	Biological effects.	Biological effects.	Biological effects.			
Water Pollution Control Administration (Interior).	Waterborne.	Waterborne.	Primary mission (plus enforcement).			
Bureau of Reclamation (Interior).	do.		Sediment control.	Primary mission.	Land reclamation.	
Army Corps of Engineers.			Navigation aspects.	Flood control.	Do.	
Soil Conservation Service (Agriculture).			Sediment control.	Supply development.	Primary mission.	
Fish and Wildlife Service (Interior).	Biological effects.		Biological effects.			
Forest Service (Agriculture).	Usage studies.	Pulp wastes.		Runoff studies.	General studies.	
Bureau of Mines (Interior).		Mineral wastes and release of minerals.	Mine drainage.		Strip mine reclamation.	
Solid Waste Office (HEW).		Primary mission.			Open dump elimination.	
Air Pollution Control Division (HEW).	Airborne.	Combustion studies.				
Atomic Energy Commission.	Biological pathways.	Radioactive materials.	Sediment control.	Hydrology.		
Agricultural Research Service (Agriculture).	Regulation and basic studies.	Agricultural wastes.	Agricultural aspects.		Soil science and pollution studies.	
Smithsonian Institution.						
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Regulation biological effects.	Space travel aspects.			Land forms.	
Tennessee Valley Authority.		Fertilizer development.	Sediment control.	Primary mission.	Land reclamation.	
	Air pollution	Atmospheric sciences	Earth or mineral sciences	Oceanography	Basic ecology	Weather modification
Environmental Science Services Administration (Commerce).	Atmospheric vectors.	General studies.	General studies.	Physical.		General studies.
Geological Survey (Interior).		Meteorite studies.	Primary mission.	Marine geology.	Paleoecology.	
National Science Foundation.		Basic studies.	Basic studies.	Basic studies.	General studies.	Basic studies.
Environmental Health Sciences Centers (HEW).	Biological effects.				do.	
Water Pollution Control Administration (Interior).					do.	
Bureau of Reclamation (Interior).						Rainmaking.
Army Corps of Engineers.				Beach erosion.		
Soil Conservation Service (Agriculture).					Wildlife conservation.	
Fish and Wildlife Service (Interior).				Marine biology.	General studies.	Lightning suppression.
Forest Service (Agriculture).					do.	
Bureau of Mines (Interior).	Abatement studies.		Primary mission.	Mineral exploitation.		
Solid Waste Office (HEW).	Combustion studies.		Mineral waste disposal.			
Air Pollution Control Division (HEW).	Primary mission (plus enforcement).					
Atomic Energy Commission.	Fallout studies.	Basic studies.	Radioactive minerals.	General studies.	Radiation aspects.	
Agricultural Research Service (Agriculture).					General studies.	
Smithsonian Institution.		Upper atmosphere physics.	Mineral classification, basic processes.	Marine biology.	do.	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.		Basic studies.	General studies (by satellite).	General studies (by satellite).		
Tennessee Valley Authority.	Abatement studies.		Fertilizer development mineral surveys.		General studies.	

Source: Taken from the Journal of Chemistry and Engineering, May 23, 1966, at p. 37.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I am introducing today be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the following materials be printed in the RECORD: First, selected material from an article by Mr. Robert H. Boyle which appeared in the December 11 issue of Sports Illustrated magazine; second, a speech entitled "Public Policy and Environmental Administration," written for delivery before the American Institute

of Biological Sciences; third, a speech entitled "Environment and Change: 'How Much?' Or 'How Good?'" which I recently delivered before the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs; fourth, selected material from a January 4, 1967, memorandum by Mr. William Van Ness, special counsel to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, discussing the need for legislation in this area and transmitting an early draft of proposed legislation; a speech entitled "The Paradox of Modern Technology," which the senior

Senator from California, a cosponsor of this measure, recently delivered before the annual convention of the County Supervisors Association of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, articles, and speeches will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2805) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct investigations, studies, surveys and research relating to the Nation's ecological

systems, natural resources and environmental quality, and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2805

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to promote and foster means and measures which will prevent or effectively reduce any adverse effects on the quality of the environment in the management and development of the Nation's natural resources, to produce an understanding of the Nation's natural resources and the environmental forces affecting them and responsible for their development and future well being, and to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans, through a comprehensive and continuing program of study, review, and research.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), in order to carry out the purposes of this title, is authorized—

(a) to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, research, and analyses relating to ecological systems and environmental quality;

(b) to document and define changes in the natural environment, including the plant and animal systems, and to accumulate necessary data and other information for a continuing analysis of these changes or trends and an interpretation of their underlying causes;

(c) to develop and maintain an inventory of existing and future natural resource development projects, engineering works, and other major projects and programs contemplated or planned by public or private agencies or organizations which make significant modifications in the natural environment;

(d) to establish a system of collecting and receiving information and data on ecological research and evaluations which are in progress or are planned by other public or private agencies or organizations, or individuals;

(e) to evaluate and disseminate information of an ecological nature to public and private agencies or organizations, or individuals in the form of reports, publications, atlases, and maps;

(f) to make available to States, counties, municipalities, institutions, and individuals, advice and information useful in restoring, maintaining, and enhancing the quality of the environment.

(g) to initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects;

(h) to encourage other public or private agencies planning development projects to consult with the Secretary on the impact of the proposed projects on the natural environment;

(i) to conduct research and studies within natural areas under Federal ownership which are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary and which are under the jurisdiction of other Federal agencies; and

(j) to assist the Council on Environmental Quality established under title II of this Act.

SEC. 102. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary is authorized to make grants, including training grants, and enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with public or private agencies or organizations, or individuals, and to accept and use donations of funds, property, personal

services, or facilities to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 103. The Secretary shall consult with and provide technical assistance to other Federal agencies, and he is authorized to obtain from such departments and agencies such information, data, reports, advice, and assistance as he deems necessary or appropriate and which can reasonably be furnished by such departments and agencies in carrying out the purposes of this Act. Any Federal agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement by the Secretary.

SEC. 104. The Secretary is authorized to participate in environmental research in surrounding oceans and in other countries in cooperation with appropriate departments or agencies of such countries or with coordinating international organizations if he determines that such activities will contribute to the objectives and purposes of this Act.

SEC. 105. Nothing in this Act is intended to give, or shall be construed as giving, the Secretary any authority over any of the authorized programs of any other department or agency of the Government, or as repealing, modifying, restricting, or amending existing authorities or responsibilities that any department or agency may have with respect to the natural environment. The Secretary shall consult with the heads of such departments and agencies for the purpose of identifying and eliminating any unnecessary duplication of effort.

SEC. 106. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. There is created in the Executive Office of the President a Council on Environmental Quality (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President to serve at his pleasure, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each member shall, as a result of training, experience, or attainments, be professionally qualified to analyze and interpret environmental trends of all kinds and descriptions and shall be conscious of and responsive to the scientific, economic, social, aesthetic and cultural needs and interests of this Nation. The President shall designate the chairman and vice-chairman of the Council from such members.

SEC. 202. (a) The primary function of the Council shall be to study and analyze environmental trends and the factors that affect these trends, relating each area of study and analysis to the conservation, social, economic, and health goals of this Nation. In carrying out this function, the Council shall—

(1) report at least once each biennium to the President on the state and condition of the environment;

(2) provide advice and assistance to the President on the formulation of national policies to foster and promote the improvement of environmental quality;

(3) obtain information using existing sources, to the greatest extent practicable, concerning the quality of the environment and make such information available to the public.

(b) The Council shall periodically review and appraise new and existing programs and activities carried out directly by Federal agencies or through financial assistance and make recommendations thereon to the President.

(c) It shall be the duty and function of the Council and the Secretary of the Interior to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the biennial Environment Quality Report required under Section 203.

SEC. 203. The President shall transmit to the Congress biennially beginning June 30, 1969, an Environmental Quality Report which

shall set forth (a) the status and condition of the major natural, manmade, or altered environmental classes of the Nation, including, but not limited to, the air, the aquatic, including marine, estuarine, and fresh water, and the terrestrial environment, including, but not limited to, the forest, dryland, wetland, range, urban, suburban, and rural environment; and (b) current and foreseeable trends in quality, management, and utilization of such environments and the effects of those trends on the social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation.

SEC. 204. The Council may employ such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. In addition, the Council may employ and fix the compensation of such experts and consultants as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this Act, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 3109 (but without regard to the last sentence thereof).

SEC. 205. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

The material presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

[From Sports Illustrated, Dec. 11, 1967]

How To STOP THE PILLAGE OF AMERICA

(By Robert H. Boyle)

(NOTE.—One of the most serious problems facing the United States today is the use of the environment, especially in regard to the conservation of wildlife resources. This magazine has often reported on threats to these values, among them the dredging of oyster reefs in Galveston Bay, the plan to stripmine in the North Cascade and the scheme to convert the Hudson River into an electric storage battery. All these threats, and all the conservation battles resulting from them, have one thing in common—they need never have occurred if there had been sound guidelines and policies to protect resources from indiscriminate abuse.

(With this in mind Sports Illustrated assigned Senior Editor Robert H. Boyle and various correspondents to the task of discovering what measures are needed to insure that our wildlife resources will not be impaired, compromised or obliterated, either wholesale or piecemeal. The issue is not one of "people or ducks." Progress is people and ducks. There is no reason why we cannot have both. In compiling this report, Boyle and SI's correspondents interviewed scientists, legislators and conservationists across the country. Not everyone made the same points—but certain common themes were struck. These recommendations merit strong consideration.)

Many of our present environmental difficulties can be attributed to the fact that no single person, agency, bureau or department in the Federal Government has an overall view of what is happening to our land and waters. No one is providing any sense of direction or continuity. Action on a problem comes, if at all, only in response to disaster or after persistent clamor by concerned citizens. Sporadic White House interest in "natural beauty" is so superficial as to be dangerous. The public is gulled into thinking problems are being met. Natural beauty is cosmetics conservation. Instead of applying pancake makeup to the landscape, we should be stopping cancer.

An essential first step would be establishment by Congress of a National Council of Ecological Advisers. This council would offer recommendations for the improvement of the environment and the use of resources and draw attention to threats that might be overlooked—or even posed—by partisan interests, such as the Federal Power Commission or the Defense Department. The council would take a broad view and yet not hesitate to deal with specifics. The council, in brief, should have complete freedom of inquiry and

suggestion. It should be able to sound an alarm over the manufacture and sale of detergents or question the approach, say, of the current Appalachia program, in which millions of dollars are being spent on highways for the region instead of on reclamation of the degraded lands and waters (the reclamation project would provide as many or more jobs for the impoverished residents of the area). Ideally, the council should include senior scientists who have shown independent and thoughtful concern for the affairs of mankind, such as René Dubos of the Rockefeller University, Lionel A. Walford of the Fish and Wildlife Service, S. Dillon Ripley secretary of the Smithsonian, A. Starker Leopold of the University of California, Paul Sears of Yale or Robert Cushman Murphy of the American Museum of Natural History. This nucleus would be supplemented by conservationists, such as David Brower of the Sierra Club, Richard Pough, past president of The Nature Conservancy, Rod Vandivert of Scenic Hudson, and a landscape architect, a historian perhaps and representatives from industry, labor and agriculture. There should be no room for the scientific hack or the politician just turned out of office and looking for a new slot at the public trough. Precedent exists for the establishment of such an organization in the Council of Economic Advisers, which has proved influential.

State legislatures would do well to establish similar conservation councils of their own. All too often state governments have complained when the Federal Government finally moved in to stop a long-standing abuse. It is time state governments assumed responsible positions. There is no more time for excuses. With the exception of a few states—for instance, Massachusetts and Wisconsin (their efforts are noted below)—most states have refused to recognize environmental problems.

An ecological inventory of the United States should be conducted both by the Federal Government and the 50 states, down to the town level. This inventory should list all natural resources, ponds, lakes, streams, agricultural lands, forests, wetlands, parks and preserves, along with notations about their value or uniqueness. Information of this sort, essential to any rational use or planning, is not now available. The information gathered should be evaluated, coded and computerized. A power company seeking a site could then be offered a number of locations where the plant would not inhibit the spawning say, of salmon or striped bass, and scientists who are interested in preserving the gene bank would be able to draw upon the information to locate undisturbed habitats where animals or plants flourish in their natural state. There are, literally, thousands of applications for such material, ranging from recreational to educational use.

States need not wait for the Federal Government to prompt them into undertaking surveys of their own. Wisconsin and Massachusetts have already done outstanding work. Several years ago Gaylord Nelson, then governor and now a Senator from Wisconsin, invited Philip H. Lewis Jr., a landscape architect from the University of Illinois, to conduct a survey. Appointed a professor at the University of Wisconsin, Lewis set to work with a team of assistants to inventory and map the state. The team noted waterfalls, mineral sites, trout streams, marshes, historic sites and other areas of value. Most resources fell into what Lewis calls "environmental corridors" along watercourses. In deciding what to buy or protect, Wisconsin set up a point system of priorities and did a demand study for each possible acquisition. A specific sales tax provided \$50 million, and, in the first year of funding, Wisconsin acquired 33,000 acres either by outright purchase or through scenic easements. (By granting the state a scenic ease-

ment, a private landowner agrees not to build; in exchange, he receives compensation.) Thus far the Wisconsin program has been going along splendidly, with strong popular support. Last year Republicans and Democrats joined to pass a water program, giving counties authority to zone land 300 feet back from each river and stream and 1,000 feet back from each lake. The counties have two years to establish zoning ordinances. If a county fails to act, the state will do the zoning.

Massachusetts, racked by periodic scandals, is not a state ordinarily thought of as being among the most advanced in good-government practices. Yet when it comes to caring for the basic natural environment, Massachusetts could give lessons to others. The Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources already has inventoried marine assets, salt marshes, outdoor recreation areas, open-space needs and inland marshes. This enlightened outlook comes not so much from on high—though Resources Commissioner Robert Yasi happens to be forward-looking—but from the concern of the people. As a result of public pressure, the state legislature in 1958 enabled cities and towns to establish conservation commissions. Composed of three to seven members, each commission surveyed the natural resources of value in its own area and under a point system made recommendations for zoning or acquisition of land. As public interest grew, the state legislature agreed to finance 50% of the acquisitions.

There is a need for more state and national parks and better management of those we already have. For example, at famous Yellowstone the Park Service's stewardship has become, in the words of Naturalist Peter Farb, "an act of official vandalism." Concessionaires have been encouraged to build a supermarket, trinket shop, laundry and 1,000 shoddy cabins within the park, while the Service itself constructed a parking lot that destroyed Daisy Geyser, one of the main attractions. Noel Elchorn, who is doing a study of the national parks for the Conservation Foundation, reports that in most parks concessionaires are so firmly entrenched that they are telling the Park Service what to do.

We need new parks not only to meet future needs but to relieve pressure on those we have. The crush of visitors to certain national parks has been such that the rationing of admissions is being considered. Parks should be chosen so as to include representative samples of all kinds of habitat and scenery in the United States. William Bronson of the California Tomorrow association has suggested the establishment of a Napa Valley National Vineyard. The Napa Valley is one place that the hand of man has blessed, but "development" for track houses could destroy it. Given protection, the Napa Valley could remain productive, its beauties unimpaired. The same might be done for other high-quality agricultural lands. (In California 140,000 acres of farmland annually succumb to the developer's bulldozer.)

We must end the engineer's tyranny over the environment. As Kenneth Boulding, professor of economics at the University of Michigan, has remarked, "The domination of almost all our resources policy by engineers and people of this kind is utterly disastrous." Engineers have technical competence to offer, but often a limited outlook as well. Putting an engineer in charge of a resource such as a river basin is no smarter than hiring a plumber to design a fountain. Then again, as William Bronson has written, "Engineers have a tradition of first establishing . . . all manner of monstrosities, and then finding economic justification for building them."

Strong congressional legislation is needed to afford protection to coastal estuaries and

wetlands. The marshes, bay bottoms and estuaries, where salt and fresh water meet, are the most valuable and productive areas on the North American continent. Marshes, for instance, are up to six times richer than the average wheat land. Yet nowhere has destruction been more savage and blind than along our coasts. Destroying wetlands or fouling estuaries makes as much sense as burning down a bank, yet the destruction continues at an appalling rate. Connecticut, for instance, now has only 20 square miles of good wetland area left. The remainder lies buried under highways, garbage dumps, factories and houses. In actuality the estuarine-wetland complex that runs from Massachusetts to Florida is one of the natural wonders of the world.

In recent years persistent encroachment and defilement has caused a dramatic decline of fish—in both commercial and sports catches. The American Littoral Society reports that between 1960 and 1965 the total catch of 18 coastal species slumped from 1.4 billion pounds to 700 million pounds—exactly half, in only five years' time. Among the fishes that are dependent on the Atlantic Coast estuaries are alewives, mackerel, Atlantic sturgeon, blackback flounder, black drum, blackfish, bluefish, croaker, fluke, king whiting, menhaden, mullet, porgy, red drum, sea trout, shad, short-nosed sturgeon, spearing, spot, striped bass, summer herring, tomcod, weakfish and white perch. Destroy the estuaries, rip up bay bottoms, fill in marshes and you destroy these species. It does no good to go out in the ocean. The ocean isn't "full of fish." The ocean is a desert by comparison with inshore Cape Cod, Long Island Sound, the Hudson River, Great South Bay, Chesapeake Bay, Pamlico Sound, et al.

The coastal fishery resources of the United States are the greatest single wildlife resource this country possesses. It offers respite to millions of people and is worth billions of dollars. So far only one state, Massachusetts, has effectively moved to protect this resource. Massachusetts law prohibits alteration of a salt marsh. When one developer fought this law, the court upheld the state, finding, "Broad Marsh is a 'salt marsh' necessary to preserve and protect marine fisheries. . . . Property is acquired by private citizens with the tacit understanding that it shall not be used to the detriment of the public, and the legislature is authorized to take action to prevent such detrimental use." Owners of marshland who seek compensation can have it set by court. So far no one has applied.

Not every state has the vigor of Massachusetts in protecting its coastal resources. New York, for example, is a study in futility. The bays and wetlands of Long Island are not protected from abuse; they are not even considered navigable waters, hence they are subject to unnecessary dredging, filling or other desolation. A favorite trick is to mine sand and gravel under the subterfuge of creating a navigable channel. An ocean liner could be floated in some of the gouges.

Even if New York took prompt and proper action, problems would still remain for numerous species of fish that move up and down the coast. If, for instance, North Carolina decided to seal off or fill in its coastal sounds the fluke population would be wiped out. Fluke eggs are laid at sea, but the larva fish are carried into the sounds by currents, and there they stay in the shallow waters, protected from larger predators and feeding on the crabs, bait-fishes and marine worms of the estuary. When the fluke are about six inches long, they begin working their way up along the coast to waiting fishermen in New Jersey, New York and Massachusetts. If the North Carolina fishery were destroyed, fishermen in the states to the north could protest, but they could not enforce any reform in North Carolina.

Sometimes fishermen are not even aware of the reasons a species suddenly disappears. This has been the case with the weakfish,

which was a tremendously popular fish in New York and New Jersey waters until 15 years ago. Despite official assurance that the weakfish would always remain abundant, it suddenly vanished. A number of reasons were given, over-fishing being the most prominent. Now marine biologists strongly suspect that commercial fishing boats working southern waters in quest of "trash" fish for cat food have been taking juvenile weakfish in the catch. The weakfish never get to move north because they are in some cat's belly. The pity of it is that cats would be just as well fed with a species of fish that has no other economic value. Contrary to popular impression, neither the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife nor any section of the Interior Department has any control of ocean fishes. (Even the President's Science Advisory Committee is misinformed; in *Effective Use of the Sea*, the committee reported that the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries governs ocean fishing.)

Obviously, legislation is needed to protect the estuarine environment and the fishes in it. Inasmuch as the states have abdicated responsibility, and inasmuch as the fish are migratory, and do not recognize state lines, the Federal Government should have authority to protect the aquatic resources of estuaries. To be sure, there will be some states-righters who will protest against "federal invasion," but the harsh truth is that the states' navigable waters are already subject to federal invasion of the worst sort, in the form of the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission, and a new federal club is needed to beat them off.

Serious consideration should be given to a conservation amendment to the Constitution. This idea has been advanced by Irving Like, a Long Island attorney and conservationist who helped to establish the Fire Island National Seashore. Like's idea is based, in part, on the premise that a national ecological survey and inventory will be taken. Like says, "Constitutional amendments are necessarily brief. This amendment should not include a shopping list, and I suggest the following draft:

"The right of the people of the United States to enjoy the outdoors and their heritage of natural resources and natural beauty shall not be violated.

"The Congress shall, at least once every five years, designate those lands and waters of the United States and its possessions, now owned or hereafter acquired which because of their unusual, natural, wilderness, scenic or historic character, shall be kept forever inviolate and administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will preserve their irreplaceable characteristics and leave them unaltered and unspoiled for future use and enjoyment.

"No federal agency, body or authority shall be authorized to exercise the power of condemnation, or undertake any public work, issue any permit, license or concession, make any rule, execute any management policy or other official act which vitally affects the people's heritage of natural resources and natural beauty, on the lands and waters now or hereafter placed in the public domain, without first giving reasonable notice to the public and holding a public hearing thereon, and any official act which involves the public domain, the natural resources of the United States, and which vitally affects the quality of the natural environment, shall be subject to judicial review and such other forms of review as may be enacted by Congress."

Like's amendment was the basis for a similar measure he advanced this year for the New York State Constitutional Convention. The delegates adopted it almost unanimously, but it went down the drain with the rest of the new constitution in the November 7 election.

The use of persistent toxic pesticides or long-range poisons should be barred. The worst of the pesticides are the chlorinated hydrocarbons: aldrin, DDD, DDT, dieldrin, heptachlor and toxaphene. A study submitted to the late President Kennedy recommended the elimination of such chemicals, but action has been slow in coming. The difficulty with the chlorinated hydrocarbons is that they take a long time to break down (as much as fifteen years for DDT) and they concentrate in the fatty tissues and organs of living creatures, at times killing them or rendering them sterile. Toxic pesticides are not the only problem. Government poisoners in the West have been indiscriminate in spreading baits for coyotes injected with compound 1080, which is also deadly to other wildlife and domestic dogs.

Detergent manufacturers, seeking new washday miracles, came up with the ABS detergents, which do not readily break down in water and can be lethal to aquatic life. When those detergents started foaming up in water supplies there was an outcry, and now the manufacturers are turning out so-called "soft" detergents. These are low in suds but rich in phosphates that can trigger detrimental algal explosions. The point of all this is that no one, no private citizen, no company, no government agency, should be allowed to inject a persistent poisonous chemical into the lands and waters of the U.S.

We need to take a new look at state and federal tax policies dealing with land values and conservation. The Sierra Club, the most vigorous national conservation organization, has suffered a loss in donations because the Internal Revenue Service, angered by club newspaper ads protesting the proposals to dam the Grand Canyon, has threatened to rule that donations are no longer deductible. If the ruling comes, the Sierra Club intends to press a court fight, but until it is resolved, other national conservation groups, not as bold to begin with, will shy away from public issues of importance.

We might look to see if our tax policies encourage wise use of the land. There is a strong suspicion that they do not and that they are rigged in favor of the developer, the realtor and the modern version of the ambulance chaser, the lawyer who specializes in zone busting. If inequities exist, they should be corrected.

PUBLIC POLICY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(Remarks by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON at the Plenary Session, 18th annual, American Institute of Biological Sciences, Texas A. & M. University, College Station, Tex., August 28, 1967)

The title you have chosen for this Plenary Session of the American Institute of Biological Sciences—"The Environment of Man Revisited"—calls to mind a fable written by Mr. James C. Rettle and published in the Fall, 1948 issue of *The Land*.

In the fable there is a planet in another solar system which is inhabited by an intelligent group of people. In the interests of science these people have been making a film record of the Earth's life history on a scale of one picture each year for the past 750 million years. At some time in the future they visit Earth and arrange to have the film shown. Time on the film moves at the rate of approximately two-million years per day. The entire film requires one full year to show with the life span of an individual man taking only 3 seconds.

As the film unrolls its story of Earth's history, the months of January, February and March show a desolate and dreary picture of geological erosion and change. Land masses shift in torrents of rain and high mountains melt away only to be thrust up in new places.

It is April before there is any indication of the presence of single-celled living organisms

in the warm sheltered coastal waters. In the middle of July the first land plants appear; in September insects appear, and the first dinosaurs are seen. About December 25 the forces of erosion begin the grinding, cutting work of nature we now know as the Grand Canyon.

According to the fable, man appears on the scene about noon on December 31 (one million years ago), a few short hours before the end of the film. The dawn of Western Civilization does not appear until five or six minutes before the film ends. Compressed within these few minutes are the Golden Age of Greece and the birth of European Civilization. Columbus will discover America 20 seconds before the projector halts and brings us to the present.

In these final few seconds of geological time the history of our Nation will unfold. The temper of the time is one of conquest, of exploitation, of mastering the wilderness, and of industrial development. The pace of environmental change gains speed. New factors and forces put in motion by man's mastery of science and technology will cause the face of Earth to change more radically than it has ever changed in a comparable time in all the generations before. Forests will be leveled, rivers polluted, and the land will be eroded. The air will become contaminated and pressures of population will increase. Critical balances and interrelationships between matter and life which nature created over millions of years will be upset and broken. Everywhere areas of open space will shrink and contract.

The fable ends by saying man has just arrived on this earth. How long will he stay?

The fable serves, I think, to give some perspective on the dynamic and changing nature of the "environment" which we are "revisiting" during this Plenary Session. It points out that as a result of man's actions the pace of environmental change on Earth is rapidly accelerating. During the last 4 seconds of the film—the past 100 years of Earth's history—forces in the form of science, technology and man's increasing ability to harness and transform energy have been added to natural forces as important determinants of environmental change. Man, in this short time, has attained an incredible capacity for extraction, production, distribution, consumption and rejection. Each of these processes takes something from our environment or adds something to it—or both. Each produces change and often the changes are not good.

Environmental quality problems caused by man, such as critical levels of air and water pollution, the control and disposal of radioactive wastes, and the proliferation of pesticides and chemicals, threaten the destruction of life itself. The pressures of population, the loss of open space and recreational opportunity, and the decay of urban areas cause inconvenience, frustration and increased mental health problems.

Today, man, rather than the impersonal forces of nature, exerts the decisive influences on the shape of the future. And with each year, this power increases.

In 1590, Edmund Spenser wrote of "the ever-whirling wheel of change, which all mortal things doth sway." In his time of the Renaissance, modern science was just emerging. The scientific, social, economic and environmental changes of that age were, however, infinitesimal when compared with today's revolution. Galileo was a lonely seeker as he formulated his theories of astronomy. Today 90 per cent of all the scientists known to history are alive and working.

Whether man's ability to work environmental change is good or bad, and whether it has been exercised wisely does not admit to simple answers. These questions are, however, deadly serious as the papers presented this morning by Mr. Brooks and Dr. Cassidy so clearly demonstrate.

They are serious because while man is increasingly able to shape and manage his environment, he must still be able to live with the consequences of his action. As biologists you know better than most that there are limits. Man, though technologically powerful, is still a frail creature and even as he works enormous changes in his environment, he is constrained by these changes and a product of their influence.

Winston Churchill recognized this concept. During World War II when Britain's House of Commons was extensively damaged by German bombs, Churchill insisted that the House be rebuilt in its exact original form, rather than to authorize the construction of a new, larger and more efficient building. Churchill feared that changing the architecture and organization of the House might alter the character of the Parliamentary debates and therefore the English democracy it sheltered. In his words, "We shape our buildings and then they shape us."

This lesson of the interrelationship between man and his surroundings has been written large in history and landscape of 20th Century America. Few people have read it, however, and even fewer have read it with understanding.

The important point to be made is that there are alternatives. There are choices which can and must be made in the management of our natural resources and our environment. Environmental decay, whether in the form of a slow unobtrusive decline in the quality of our surroundings or in the form of a nuclear accident, is not an inevitable by-product of industrial progress.

Choosing between available alternatives will require that we develop intelligent long-range public policies on environmental quality and on the administration of the environment. While we have already made some significant progress towards this end, the movement of government from the role of arbiter among conflicting resource interests to the role of trustee for the environment as a whole is still far from complete.

For too long government has reacted to environmental crises rather than anticipating and avoiding them. The future will require that more effort be spent on treating the causes, rather than the symptoms of environmental decay.

Fortunately, the public is ready to accept knowledgeable and effective governmental participation in making management decisions which effect the quality of the environment. In fact, the public demands it.

Today, private foundations, universities and governmental agencies are tripping over each other to open offices and divisions to deal with the problems of environmental decay and degradation. Projects and proposals, suggestions and criticisms are the manifestations of our belated concern for our surroundings. These responses to environmental decay have a number of things in common.

First is the proposition that the "environment" is at least a useful if not a necessary focus for the formulation of public policies and programs to deal with the qualitative decline of the Nation's natural resources.

Second is a dissatisfaction with traditional methods by which environment-affecting actions have often been undertaken. For example, in the past the use of natural resources has often been ruled by opportunistic considerations. If it proved the most economical course of action to use rivers, streams and the atmosphere as a means of dispersing waste products, that course of action was followed. If highways and power lines could be built more economically in straight lines without regard to parks, aesthetics, and other types of land use, they were built in straight lines.

In the future we must strive to improve the methods of economic analysis by which environmental management decisions are

made. We must recognize that the marketplace often deals in illusions. And much of the thrift of yesterday turns out today to be prodigality because the price tag did not include all of the social and economic costs.

We must insure that the decision-making processes of government recognize that there are important values which cannot be properly evaluated in economic terms. The Planning, Programming, Budgeting System—PPBS—which is now being implemented throughout the Federal government may provide a management tool that can lead to better decisions. However, it is only a tool, not a substitute for sound judgment.

Finally, there is a growing recognition that the sum total of environment-affecting actions must at some level of government be assessed and evaluated.

Projected trends, their implications and available alternatives should be made readily available to policy makers. In the past we have had "natural resource administration." This has involved a different set of values and institutions for dealing with each separate resource. The accelerating pace of environmental change and the increasing frequency of instances in which man's actions result in unanticipated and unintended harmful consequences indicates a need for a wider, more knowledgeable view of natural resource management. This wider view involves what, for want of a better term, might be characterized as "environmental administration."

What is the proper role of government in "environmental administration" and in insuring that there will be a quality environment for present and future generations? Does environmental quality control require governmental reorganization? Are new powers necessary to control and regulate private actions which are not in the public interest? Who, ultimately, is to determine what constitutes a "good" or a "quality" environment? Does preventive action and rational planning require Federal land use planning and new constitutional powers for the Federal government?

These are but a few of the many questions which must be answered as the necessity for effective environmental administration and quality control becomes urgent.

In the past most governmental action to ensure environmental quality has proceeded on a case-by-case problem solving basis. When the need for the preservation of natural values was felt, a system of national parks was established; when widespread erosion threatened the landscape, the Soil Conservation Service was established; when water and air pollution problems proved to be more than the State government alone could handle, Federal programs were established. Obviously, many more examples could be given.

In the future, reacting to particular crises on a case-by-case basis will not be sufficient if we are to preserve and maintain environmental quality. An effective program of environmental administration will require adjustments in the existing structure of our government. Rather than wholesale reorganization, however, I am inclined to think that organization and redirection of the functions of existing agencies is more likely to obtain objectives, and with less delay and incident friction.

Responsible management of our Nation's natural resources will also require sensitive coordination of the projects and goals of various government agencies. Legitimate ends must be achieved, but not at the expense of environmental values which are belatedly considered equally important.

The practice of arbitrarily dividing jurisdiction over the several parts and segments of the biophysical environment among separate agencies, departments and congress-

sional committees without effective coordination is a luxury we cannot afford.

In the future we must attempt to come to grips with the problems of "value" and "value choices" in managing our natural heritage.

Value judgments are always hard to make. In determining what constitutes a "good" or a "quality" environment many difficult decisions will have to be made. Even if we cannot at present be confident that we can describe an environment that everyone would find "good", we can at least identify and agree upon environmental conditions that virtually everyone can agree are "bad." And this is a basis upon which to build; a basis upon which to mobilize and begin the effort to have both the private and public sectors of the Nation reflect an intelligent concern for the ramifications of their decisions on the future quality of the environment.

Not long ago, the idea of a public responsibility for the state of the economy, for public health, and for minimally acceptable living conditions was considered utopian. Tomorrow the idea of public responsibility for environmental quality will, as it inevitably must, win public and governmental support.

But public responsibility alone will not be enough. There must also be private responsibility for environmental quality.

As many of you are aware, there have been legislative proposals in recent years to establish in the Office of the President, a Council of Environmental Quality Advisors. The Council's functions would include oversight, assessment, and policy recommendations. While no formal action has as yet been taken, these and many other proposals for dealing with the problems of environmental decay are currently receiving careful study in both the Congress and in the Executive Branch.

The fact that proposals such as these are being made and receiving serious study is significant. Eventually they may prove that Joseph Wood Crutch was unduly pessimistic when he said there is increasing evidence that "man's ingenuity outruns his intelligence." And that though competent to run a primitive world, man may not be competent to "manage the more complicated and closely integrated world which he is, for the time, powerful enough to destroy."

It is clear that we must have more research into the scientific and social causes of environmental decay. Government and private industry need more professional people with multidisciplinary backgrounds to serve as administrators in maintaining a quality environment. Engineers must have specialized training to build, but they should also have the background and ability to recognize the consequences of their actions, the available alternatives, and their impact on other values our culture deems important.

The future will see enlarged opportunities for biologists to serve in maintaining environmental quality. As professional biologists you have an obligation to help educate the engineers, politicians, and other decision-makers on the consequences of their actions. They must learn to be generalists as well as specialists and so must you. Government will need your help if man is to be saved from himself and the forces of change he has created.

ENVIRONMENT AND CHANGE: "How Much?" or "How Good?"

(Address by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, Marylhurst College, Portland, Oreg., September 3, 1967)

In the decade of the 1960's, the American people are making an unprecedented demand for the protection and the improvement of the physical environment in which we live. A profound change has occurred in the

awareness and attitudes of people and this has been reflected in the responses of Government and leaders outside of Government.

President John F. Kennedy, less than one month after assuming office in 1961, sent to the Congress a *Special Message on Natural Resources*. The message redefined and re-oriented Federal resources policy. It identified new areas for attention, including water and air pollution and other environmental issues.

In 1962, the President amplified his policies in a *Message on Conservation* and in May he convened the White House Conference on Conservation. The purpose of the meeting was, in the words of Secretary of the Interior Udall, to introduce the President's program for "the conservation of the American environment." The White House Conference of 1962 was a distinct break with the past. Instead of dealing with conservation as a set of separate and distinct entities, the Conference attempted to focus attention on conserving the total environment.

That very year, Rachel Carson's *The Silent Spring* appeared as a series of articles in *The New Yorker* magazine and later hit the best-seller list in book form. While initiating a national controversy over the safety of chemicals used in controlling plant and animal pests, Miss Carson aroused public awareness of a whole new range of issues. We began to have a greater realization that many public and private decisions were being made without proper attention to some of the consequences. And these consequences are critical, involving the very health and safety of our people, our continued prosperity, and the enjoyment of our lives.

We have come to understand that the pollution of our air and water, the deterioration of our cities, the congestion of our transportation systems, the littering of our landscape, and the uglification of the outdoors, are not inevitable and unavoidable consequences of our industrial society.

In November of 1965, President Johnson released a report of his Science Advisory Committee entitled *Restoring the Quality of Our Environment*. It is one of the most significant public policy documents ever issued by Government. The recommendations of this distinguished panel amount to an outline of a national policy for protecting and improving the quality of the American environment.

A national policy is required. Machinery is required to implement a national policy. This is an enormous decision-making task.

Making rational decisions, profiting by past mistakes, and learning to anticipate future problems in the management of our environment becomes a matter of greater urgency because the pace of change in the world is quickening. The period of time between each new acquisition and application of scientific and technological power is growing successively shorter.

The modified scale and scope of change is such that the world is altered as we walk in it. The years of a man's life no longer measure small growths and rearrangements. They measure instead a great upheaval of change. And too often these changes are not for the better.

Writing on "The Era of Radical Change" in *Fortune* magazine, Max Ways has said:

"Within a decade or two it will be generally understood that the main challenge to . . . society will turn not around the production of goods but around the difficulties and opportunities involved in a world of accelerating change and everwidening choices . . . Trying to 'make sense' of change will [soon] come to be our basic industry. Aesthetic and ethical values will be evolving along with the choices to which they will be applied. The question about progress will be 'how good?' rather than 'how much?'"

The headlong pace of development is forcing both the public and the private sector to

accept responsibilities and adopt policies that would have been unthinkable ten years ago. We are deeply engaged in trying to manage our total environment as parts of a "complete system" of interrelated elements rather than as separate parts. This is a truly revolutionary development.

The Federal government has been moving toward management practices which account for the total environment. We have actually adopted in practice ideas which have not been fully accepted in theory. For example, we proceeded from single-purpose water development for irrigation or navigation to multiple-purpose projects for power development, water supply, flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife resources. Long ago we developed the policy of sustained yield management and multiple-use in the National Forest System.

These are but two examples of efforts to manage resources with a number of environmental values as well as economic values in mind. Need I point out to the members of the organizations represented here that the efforts of the Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Corps of Engineers are not universally acclaimed? The most enthusiastic admirers of these agencies of government make no claim that they succeed in satisfying all interests or resolving all disputes. Certainly, the critics have not been kind in their assessment of how well the total public interest is served.

The size of the decision-making problem in government is well illustrated in the work of these agencies. When they act or when they fail to act, their decisions have a very visible impact on how we live and how we make a living. They develop and manage resources which are the economic life blood of a multitude of public and private enterprises. They must deal with a host of other entities of the Federal government. These dealings involve both co-operation and competition; consultation and dispute. The agencies work with state and local governmental bodies, each of which has its own power and responsibilities to uphold.

This is but one segment of a complex of decision-making relationships involving all of government and all outside of government. Just think of the host of individual decisions being made every day which will have an important impact on our environment! Obviously, when we talk of bringing about better decisions to maintain a better environment, we must mean a process of educating and properly influencing decision-makers. We have not the means nor, I hope, the desire, to mobilize some super-organization or super-intelligence to mastermind the operation of a utopian environment.

True, there are proposals to reorganize governmental responsibilities and even to extend the authority of government to deal with these issues. Perhaps some greater efficiencies can be achieved by certain reorganizations, but I am inclined to believe that organization and redirection of the functions of existing agencies is more likely to obtain objectives, and with less delay and incident friction.

Far more important in my view, than any tinkering with the machinery of government will be the work of the many private and independent organizations such as those represented here in the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs. You will mobilize public opinion; you will bring your influence to bear on the decision-maker. You have a great responsibility.

Earlier this year I participated in a panel discussion before a meeting of the National Forest Products Association on the subject of "The Need for an Enlightened Public Land Use Policy." I took advantage of the occasion to offer some unsolicited advice to the members of that Association. This is what I said:

"I have heard that some groups in the forest industry are 'seriously concerned about the unusually large number of proposals now before the Senate Interior Committee to unnecessarily stop timber growing and harvesting on commercial forest lands.' This attitude disturbs me. I think it is a mistake for anyone in the forest industry to retreat to a position of adamant opposition to all proposals to preserve part of our national heritage as Parks and Wilderness Areas. What the forest industry should really be interested in is not the number of proposals before the Congress, but whether these proposals are given fair and sensible consideration and whether all the facts, ramifications and alternatives have been thoroughly and objectively evaluated.

"Where industry's response is totally negative, government, as the representative of the public interest, is forced to act without the full benefit of industry's potential contribution. Where industry's response is forward looking and reasonable, Congress and the Administration will cooperate in resolving problems of mutual concern."

Now, I am taking advantage of this occasion to offer somewhat the same unsolicited advice to members of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs. We in the Congress need your advice and counsel. But I know that some of my colleagues in the Congress have been persuaded that some of the organizations engaged in conservation work are strictly a negative force. To the extent that this attitude prevails, the effectiveness of your work is diminished.

Every time a tree is cut, a mineral mined, a dam constructed, or a road built, the public interest is not being attacked. Too often, I think, the efforts of well-motivated and constructive organizations are being characterized as a rear-guard action by a valiant few in the white hats against the depredations of reckless exploiters in the black hats. Even the dramatic appeal of this kind of over-simplified melodrama has faded with overexposure on television. To use a recently popular phrase, it risks opening up a considerable "credibility gap."

There is a temptation when one is altruistically engaged in supporting the public interest to attribute to oneself an exclusive possession of virtue. Politicians are notorious for their ability to delude themselves this way. May I urge you to avoid this pitfall of politicians.

Not enough attention is being paid by any of us to some of the "nuts and bolts" problems that we face. Let me illustrate:

Congress has authorized 48 new park areas since 1961. This is some indication that the Congress takes seriously the need for protecting natural values and meeting the outdoor recreational needs of Americans.

In 1961 over 86 million people visited our national parks. Just five years later the number had risen to approximately 134 million—a 53 per cent increase.

During this same period of time—from 1961 to 1967—the full-time staff of the Park Service, including construction employees, rose from 5,637 to 6,579. Just 942 new people were taken on to handle the tremendous increase in responsibility and volume of activity.

Look at it another way. In 1962 the amount of money appropriated for development of the National Park System was about \$59 million. In the last fiscal year, the amount appropriated was \$6 million less.

Is it any wonder that serious questions are being raised about the quality of the environment in some of our parks?

In 1965, the Congress adopted the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. We established the fund—to be fed by entrance fees and other sources—as a means of providing the wherewithal for both State and Federal acquisition of new outdoor areas.

Just two years later we are painfully aware

that the fund is grossly inadequate for its purpose. A recent Department of the Interior report estimates that the fund will be \$2.7 billion below the amount required for the period 1967-1977. Revenues coming into the fund have been below expectations and the cost of acquiring recreational land has spiraled at a far higher rate than the general increase in land values.

Land speculation has driven acquisition costs up 100 per cent at the Point Reyes National Seashore. Eleven new authorized outdoor areas, including the Cape Cod National Seashore and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, are being jeopardized by runaway cost escalation. These areas have special significance because they are near congested population centers, with particular need for natural outdoor recreation areas.

One way to lick this land price escalation problem is to acquire the lands quickly after authorization by the Congress. To do this, the money must be made available. I have introduced legislation to bolster the Land and Water Conservation Fund for a period of five years with revenues from mineral leasing of public lands, the Outer Continental Shelf lands, and certain receipts from the national forests and national grasslands. All of these revenues are presently deposited in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. They would add approximately \$400 million a year for each of the five years to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for use by the States as well as the Federal government. As you know, the greater proportion of money in the Fund has recently been allocated to the States.

My bill would also authorize new techniques for the acquisition of lands, as approved by Congress, including advance contract authority and a leaseback or sellback method of acquiring the desired degree of control over lands within units of the National Park System when it is not necessary or desirable to acquire fee title to the property.

I will push for action on this legislation during this Congress and I hope you will lend your support to this effort.

This year, the Senate has approved legislation to create a National Scenic Rivers System. My Committee has approved for early action in the Senate the bill to establish the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore.

Ready for early action by the Interior Committee are measures to establish a Redwoods National Park and a North Cascades National Park. I want to see the Senate approve bills to create both of these magnificent additions to our National Park System before we adjourn this year.

However, authorizing legislation for all new park proposals is meeting growing resistance as reports pile up of funding shortages, escalating land costs, and a lack of support for proper development in existing parks. There has even been talk in the Congress of de-authorizing certain outdoor areas if our process of authorization, acquisition, and development is not put on a more orderly basis.

Is this not a challenge to conservationists, to those who love and appreciate our National Parks and our other natural areas? This is just one example of the need for a conservation strategy that will mobilize the support of the American people. Support is required not just for a battle here, or a rear-guard action there, but for a fundamental and continuing program to make our country a better place in which to live, a cherished place of beauty passed on with pride from one generation to the next.

In his last speech, Adlai Stevenson summarized both our reliance on and our obligation to our environment when he said:

"We travel together, passengers on a little space ship, dependent upon its vulnerable supplies of air and soils, . . . preserved from

annihilation only by the care, the work and I will say the love, we give our fragile craft."

MEMORANDUM

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1967.

To Senator Jackson.

From Bill Van Ness.

Re A proposed legislative program on the problems of "environmental quality and the management of natural resources."

In recent years there has been growing private and governmental concern over a vaguely defined subject which has been variously characterized as "environmental quality," "environmental planning and control," "technology and the environment," "the environment and social change," etc.

The causes of this concern stem, in large measure, from man's increasing mastery of science and technology. This mastery has enabled man to work enormous changes in his physical environment and has made possible a great deal that is good in modern civilization. But science, technology, and the changes man has worked on the environment have also brought unanticipated side effects and fallout in the form of air, water, noise and aesthetic pollution, pesticides, urban blight, loss of recreational opportunities, erosion of the land, transportation problems, and a spiraling deterioration of the Nation's natural resources.

The following recent news releases provide a rough picture of the nature and extent and, unfortunately, the disarray which has characterized initial public and governmental recognition and reaction to the challenge these problems present.

"Bureau of the Budget asks each Department and Agency of government to review the Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee on 'Restoring the Quality of our Environment' . . .

"Department of Health, Education and Welfare establishes Special Task Force to study the problems of environmental quality in the United States . . .

"Air, water, solid waste, noise, aesthetic pollution and the deterioration of environmental quality occupy the attention of Congress and promise to be the major domestic problems in the next century . . .

"National Sciences Foundation establishes Division of Environmental Sciences . . .

"Resources for the Future, Inc. establishes group to study environmental quality problems . . .

"Scholars from universities and major research institutions contend it is impossible to conduct broad scale research programs into the ramifications, alternatives and policy implications of environmental quality problems because no existent governmental agency has the authority to sponsor such studies due to the fragmented division of responsibility among a virtual maze of agencies . . .

"The National Academy of Sciences in a recent report on Waste Management and Control calls for the establishment of a National Commission to study problems connected with the increasing deterioration of environmental quality . . .

All of these projects, proposals and criticisms have a number of things in common. The first is the proposition that the concept of *environment* is at least a useful if not a *necessary* focus in the formulation of public policies and programs to deal with the qualitative decline of the Nation's natural resources.

Second, is a dissatisfaction with traditional methods by which environment-affecting actions have been undertaken. For example, most past decisions concerning the use of natural resources have been relegated to the market place. If it proved the most economical course of action to use rivers,

streams and the atmosphere as a means of dispersing waste products, that course of action was followed. If highways could be built cheapest in straight lines without regard to parks, aesthetics and other types of land use, they were built in straight lines. Dissatisfaction with the decisions dictated by economical considerations of economics alone in these and many other instances of natural resource administration is today coalescing into a recognition that the market system does not always arrive at the best possible decisions, and that there is a need for continued, knowledgeable and far-sighted study to determine the impact which alternative uses of natural resources will have on the shape and quality of the future environment of the nation.

Third is a recognition that the sum total of environment-affecting actions must at some level of government be assessed and evaluated in qualitative terms. Projected trends, their implications and available alternatives should be made readily available to policy makers. In the past we have had "natural resource administration"; this has involved a different set of values and institutions for dealing with each separate resource. The activities depicted in the above news releases indicate a need for a wider view of natural resource programs. This wider view involves "environmental administration."

Finally, these environment-centered projects are all concerned with "quality"—or in other words, with *values* and *value choices* in the decision-making processes. They reflect a reaction to the now generally acknowledged fact that environment-affecting goals in our society have often been inconsistent, incoherent and contradictory. Some goals are of doubtful consistency with what is known to be necessary to human well-being. Insofar as this is so, the duty of government to safeguard and advance human welfare, to make and to implement public decisions that a society knowledgeable of its own needs, interests and potentialities *ought* to make, cannot be effectively carried out.

In some respects, this newly found and now popular concern for environmental quality represents a break from the past and a recognition that new thinking and new approaches are needed. This concern also represents a recognition that government in America, at present, has no charge to deal comprehensively with environmental questions. Environmental issues are approached only through specific environment-affecting responsibilities such as protection of water supply (exclusively a public health measure until recently), prevention of soil erosion (an aid to agriculture), prohibitions on wildlife overskill (for recreational and scientific reasons), creation of natural areas and parks (for recreational purposes), etc. Characteristically, each of these activities is within the sole jurisdiction of one office, bureau or agency which tends to view its mission as an end in itself; a task of self perpetuation that is carried out with only minimal—and this usually coerced—reference to the larger responsibility of government for managing and maintaining environmental quality.

It should, however, be recognized that the divisions of responsibility which exist in government for various aspects of environmental quality control and decision-making are in some measure a necessary and unavoidable allocation of responsibility. Some problems such as air and water pollution, soil erosion, parks, and outdoor recreation require specialized treatment, responses and administration. The task of sustaining an environment which is suitable for man and capable of supporting the standard of living that Americans demand and expect, requires that many diverse problems be attacked from many angles and on many battlefronts.

Too often, though, there is a failure to coordinate the specific projects and goals of various agencies in a manner such that they may be attained without a concomitant deterioration of other values which are belatedly considered equally important. The fractionalized allocation of responsibility for specific resource decisions frustrates coordinated public, Congressional or Presidential policies and action on broad scale environmental issues. Dividing control over the several parts and segments of the biophysical environment between separate agencies, departments and Congressional committees without effective coordination and oversight results in a situation where each pursues its unilateral course independent of the others and often without sufficient regard to the larger environmental consequences of their actions. Further frustrating any effort to institute more comprehensive environmental policies and controls in government are interagency rivalries and the often concerted opposition of natural resource users who constitute "agency" and "special interest" lobbies.

Greater cooperation, coordination and communication between agencies charged with environmental quality responsibilities is needed if programs are to be properly developed, evaluated and administered in a manner that will enhance overall, long-range environmental quality and increase the efficiency and wisdom with which natural resources are managed. The fact of the matter is, however, that the Federal government is not well structured for the administration of complex environmental issues or to offer very meaningful alternatives to past methods of coping with environmental problems. Compensatory measures have been sought through legislation and interagency agreements and understandings which require joint consultation and planning in specified cases of natural resources administration. While this represents an improvement in some areas of environmental administration and policy-making (pesticides problems, water quality, etc.), they are more in the nature of palliatives than basic reforms, and their accomplishments are at the technical and administrative rather than policy level. In effect, they treat the symptoms rather than the basic problem.

Functions of oversight and assessment, insofar as they are presently fulfilled, are vested with Congress and the Bureau of the Budget. Budget's concern is more technical and monetary than policy oriented, while the segmented committee structure of Congress, coupled with inadequate time and staff to survey the broad range of environmental quality problems, make it improbable that Congress can be expected to provide a continuous and informed substitute for administrative machinery through which a comprehensive environmental public policy can be developed and applied.

In recognition of this, further on in this memorandum will be found a legislative proposal which, among other things, considers alternative proposals for the creation of institutional machinery for dealing more effectively with problems of environmental quality and the management of natural resources. The thrust of the proposal is not aimed at reorganization, centralization of authority or increased regulation. What it does aim at, however, is to stimulate and increase the level of governmental awareness, consideration and research into the potential ramifications and consequences of past and present natural resources decisions on the shape and quality of the future environment of the Nation.

The present diversity of interests and values of private and public groups in relation to environmental quality, control, management and planning are, as has been noted, major factors in fractionalizing public re-

sponsibility. Institutional innovations would to some extent minimize this diversity. But equally important is the need for public discussion and definition of the larger purposes and goals of publication.

In an open democratic society environmental policy can scarcely be any more coherent than popular consensus will permit. Therefore, it is essential that the values and perceptions which predominate in society—and ultimately influence the objectives that administrative action will pursue—be values which have been knowingly formed with a full appreciation of the parameters and the limits of man's ability to affect his environment without at some future time suffering an aftermath of harmful effects, foregone alternatives and irreversible decisions.

There is, as has been noted, growing concern for environmental quality. Can this concern be coalesced into a consensus for action? It is apparent that even if we cannot at present be confident that we can describe an environment that everyone would find "good," we can at least identify and agree upon environmental conditions that virtually everyone would agree were "bad." And this, it is submitted, is a basis upon which to build; a basis upon which to mobilize and begin the effort to have the private and public sectors of the Nation reflect an intelligent concern for the ramifications of their decisionmaking processes on the future quality of the environment.

The fact that there has not been a comprehensive national environmental policy, and that our past institutional arrangements have been better adapted to exploitation of the environment than to its rational planned use, protective custody and self-renewing development does not mean that there should not or will not in the future be an environmental policy. Not long ago, the idea of a public responsibility for the state of economy, for public health, and for minimally acceptable living conditions was considered utopian. Tomorrow the idea of public responsibility for environmental quality will, as it inevitably must, win public and governmental acceptance. The question today is how far distant that tomorrow will be. This will be determined in part by the public's realization that a crises stage has been reached in environmental problems. Unfortunately, however, the crises of environmental change and deterioration tend to be "quiet crises" and tardy spurs to action. The history of water pollution is a prime example here. The rare "act of God," whether a flood, hurricane, or earthquake, draws an immediate response of millions of dollars and concerted governmental action. The gradual and cumulative poisoning of the environment and its slow, unobtrusive decline in quality falls, however, to elicit response, to excite research, to give impetus to decision-makers in search of alternatives or to do more than win an occasional page in obscure scholarly journals on ecology, biology or urban planning. There are, of course, exceptions. Water and air pollution are no longer "quiet crises." The same is true to a lesser extent of pesticide use and problems associated with disposal of radioactive wastes. These, however, are the exceptional cases where the nature and scope of the problems have become so obvious that to forestall positive action would invite disaster.

There is some danger that the money and the national attention currently being brought to bear on the "critical" environmental quality problems of water pollution, urban renewal, open areas acquisition, etc., may distort the long-range objectives which must be achieved. Clean water, rehabilitated cities and more open space in and of themselves are not the ultimate values which government seeks to attain. Considered in isolation, they are simply means to the end of a quality environment. As contributing

parts to a larger value, there is a need to recognize them as such. To have cleansed and purified all the waters of the Nation at a cost of \$100 billion may, with the hindsight of a future vantage point, appear ridiculous if we fail to timely recognize and cope with other less-glamorous environmental quality problems. It is believed that the legislative program proposed further on in this memorandum will help to bring into focus the overall nature of the environmental quality problems faced by the Nation and provide the research and leadership necessary for their resolution.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Future environments of North America edited by F. Fraser Darling and John P. Milton, Natural History Press, Garden City, New York (1966)

Environmental Quality in a Growing Economy, edited by Henry Jarrett, Resources for the Future, Inc., Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md. (1966)

Restoring the Quality of our Environment, Report of the Environmental Pollution Panel, President's Science Advisory Committee, (November 1965)

Various papers and articles by Professor Lynton K. Caldwell, Department of Government, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

THE PARADOX OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, before the annual meeting of the County Supervisors Association, Fresno, Calif., October 18, 1967)

As we meet here today, two-thirds of the twentieth century has elapsed. The first sixty-seven years have brought great changes in man's way of life—changes which were barely perceptible on the horizon in 1900.

At the beginning of the century, H. G. Wells put his fertile imagination to work to guess what life would be like by the year 2000. He was successful in predicting the coming urban sprawl, the blight of central cities and the growth of our freeway systems, but he also foresaw efficient urban rapid transit systems which, regrettably, few of our communities have achieved. Of air transportation he said:

"I do not think it at all probable that aeronautics will ever come into play as a serious modification of transport and communication. . . . Man is not, for example, an albatross, but a land biped, with a considerable disposition toward being made sick and giddy by unusual motions, and however he soars he must come to earth to live."

Wells viewed the world of the year 2000 without the knowledge which we have accumulated during the first two-thirds of the century. Today our vision of the future is obscured by two conflicting images of what lies in store for the human race. The mushroom-shaped cloud reminds us that man has developed the capacity to destroy mankind. The earth satellite, circling the globe, is a symbol of man's ability to solve the most difficult technical problems for the benefit of the human race.

In a simple world, we could pigeon-hole each new idea, good or bad, mushroom cloud or satellite. But the world of 1967 does not admit of those simple judgments. The weapons research which has brought us to a capability of complete obliteration bears the seed of unlimited peaceful bounty. It represents part of the paradox of this age. And America's great burst of industrial and technological creativity carries the latent potential to make our environment unfit for human habitation.

The whole melange of environmental problems—air pollution, water pollution, radiation, contamination, noise pollution, dangerous insecticides and pesticides, and urban blight—is with us as a stark reality.

The gravity of these threats to human life

is amplified by the rate at which population is growing in the world.

In Latin America, for example, a million people die each year from starvation and malnutrition. That situation can only get worse, since by the end of this century Latin America will have, by estimate, one billion people.

There is a temptation to ignore any danger in crowding as long as we can produce enough food to feed our people and enough goods to sustain our economy. Yet overpopulation can destroy the quality of human life.

Some scientists have studied field mouse population explosion to learn about the strains of overpopulation on a society. The end of a mouse outbreak is always abrupt. At the peak, food begins to run short and crowding leads to tension and fighting. Tension, food shortage, crowding, disease, fighting, cannibalism—all these appear and lead into the descending spiral, a rapid decline that ends in mass die-off.

The dangers of overpopulation will be increased by the extreme adaptability of the human race. Humans can become adapted to almost anything—polluted air, treeless hills, traffic jams, water shortages, or urban and suburban blight. But in one way or another, we have to pay later for the adjustment we make to undesirable conditions.

Even feeding the skyrocketing population may prove impossible. The spread of American cities eats up at least a million and a half acres of open land every year.

One hundred and fifty years ago California's population consisted of scattered Indian tribes and a handful of new settlers. The Indians have long since disappeared, and our population has grown to 20 million. By the end of this century we will need space for 50 million Californians. Dr. Maurice L. Peterson, Dean of Agriculture for the University of California, has said:

"Urbanization of prime farmland is one of the most serious problems facing us in agriculture. The population is increasing at a far more rapid rate than our ability to produce food, and farmers are being forced up into the hills where it costs more to produce. California produces 25 per cent of the nation's table food, 43 per cent of the fresh vegetables, 42 per cent of the nut and fruit crops, but conservative estimates show that half of California's farm cropland will go to housing and industry in the next 33 years."

What are the lethal by-products of modern technology which reveal a potential twenty-first century apocalypse?

The clear, fresh air which was America's heritage has long since disappeared from every major city in the country. The most tragic single air pollution incident occurred in Donora, Pennsylvania, in 1948. The community was blanketed for several days by a fog that gathered the chemical wastes of the tiny coal mining town. Half the population of the town fell ill, and 17 persons died.

The highly salubrious climate of the Los Angeles basin has always contained the meteorological building blocks for severe air pollution problems. By the mid-40's increasing population, industrialization and automobiles brought on smarting eyes, coughing, and sore lungs. By 1980 the use of gasoline in the Los Angeles area will have increased fourfold since smog was first noticed around 1945.

More than a decade ago, I was privileged to be the author of the first legislation to bring the resources of the federal government to bear on air pollution research—the Air Pollution Control Act of 1955. More recently I have co-sponsored the Clean Air Act of 1963, and have urged a more active role for private industry in fighting the scourge of air pollution.

California, recognizing the danger of air pollution, mobilized its efforts years before other states. As a result, our state controls are the most advanced in the nation. The

Senate, recognizing that fact, made a special exemption in the Air Quality Act of 1967 which it recently passed. The Senate exemption would preserve California state standards for the control of motor vehicle emission, rather than allowing the weaker federal standards to pre-empt the field. Although the exemption recognizing California's leadership was stricken by a House Committee, I believe we will be successful in retaining the exemption in the bill as it is finally enacted.

In recent decades man has begun to burn the fossil fuels, coal, petroleum and natural gas, that were locked in sedimentary rocks over 500 million years, releasing vast quantities of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. The best approximations are that by the year 2000 there will be 25 per cent more atmospheric carbon dioxide than was present during the nineteenth century. Scientists predict that the concentration of carbon dioxide will heat up the polar areas and cause the Antarctic icecap to melt. They say that in one thousand years sea level will rise 400 feet.

Other scientists are concerned that the increase of pollutants, other than carbon dioxide, which filter the sun's heat rather than creating a natural greenhouse, will cause the polar icecaps to expand, bringing on a second ice age.

As the hazards increase, the nation gropes for effective answers or solutions to meet the challenge of air pollution. Nothing short of an all-out exploitation of federal, state, local and private resources should be tolerated by the people whose lives and surroundings are at stake.

Recently, nine children in Washington County, Utah, were hospitalized to determine the cause of abnormal nodules in their thyroid glands. The tests were inconclusive, but as a grim reminder of the age in which we live, the doctors found that fifteen years earlier each of these children had been exposed to radioactive iodine produced on the nearby Nevada atomic test site.

In 1953 the Atomic Energy Commission predicted that fallout would be evenly distributed over the globe so that no area would receive an excessive amount. By 1958 we had learned that fallout levels in the north temperate zone were more than ten times higher than at the equator or the poles. As our nuclear technology expands, so must our understanding of side effects. We may pay for our bad guesses for countless generations.

America is blessed with abundant water supplies, but our industrial and urban society has been built on the false assumption that our waters are bottomless pools into which waste can be dumped, much as we slip razor blades into the slot at the back of the medicine cabinet. Well, the space behind the slot is filled, as far as our nation's waters are concerned. We can no longer afford the luxury of using our waterways as a common waste receptacle.

Some thirty years ago chemical technology produced synthetic detergents which were much more efficient washing agents, especially in hard water, than soap. A multi-billion dollar detergent industry was founded without any adequate knowledge of the side effects of these detergents. But when Americans began to dump three billion pounds of detergent into our water each year, mounds of foam appeared in rivers and good stiff heads of foam formed on glasses of water.

Only then did we realize that the new detergents differed from soap in an important aspect. Soap is readily broken down by bacteria, but detergents are not. Fortunately, the worst is past. The industry developed new "biodegradable" detergents which are broken down by bacteria in modern urban sewage treatment plants. The detergent episode is a classic example of the failure of

scientists to predict the effect of a seemingly beneficial change in our environment.

Over forty years ago, the City of Pomona saw that it was wasteful and wrong to use water only once, pollute it, then dispose of it. Imitating Mother Nature, the city built one of the first waste water reclamation units in the United States.

The local governments of the semi-arid southern part of our state have pioneered in the re-use of waste water. Many California cities and counties are now looking to reclaimed water as a major source of their future supply.

Since World War II and the advent of DDT, we have seen a revolution in the use of insecticides. But wholly unexpected side effects can often create problems worse than the one the substance was developed to cure. In one Bolivian town, DDT sprayed to control malarial mosquitoes also killed most of the cats. With the cats gone, the town was invaded by wild mouse-like animals that carried black typhus. Before new cats were brought to restore the balance of nature, several hundred people were killed by the disease.

Last month, a news bulletin out of Tijuana told of thirty-four children dead from insecticide in their bread. Death and serious illness from insecticide poisoning are rare in the U.S., but everyone in this room has a measurable quantity of these substances in his body, accumulated mainly from contaminated food and water. It is estimated that twenty tons of DDT residue is contained in the bodies of the people of this country.

Noise itself can be a dangerous type of pollutant to our environment. Urban noise, for example, damages the hearing and degrades the quality of life in our cities. Jet noises are among the worst, and as we move on to the supersized and supersonic jets of the future we must learn what the mental and physical cost will be for persons living near airports and under flight patterns.

In downtown Los Angeles, 66 per cent of the land is taken up by parking lots or streets. We are developing urban complexes so fast that one can travel a hundred miles or more before reaching open country. The leapfrogging haphazard pattern of development hastens the process of spread.

The value of parks, lakes, streams and open green spaces is not wholly aesthetic. In many areas they modify the climate, purify or humidify the air, and maintain thermal control for the metropolitan area. It has been estimated that filling of the San Francisco Bay would raise the temperature of the Bay Area by five to ten degrees and blanket it with a thick layer of smog.

In 1965 I supported a program to make \$235 million in open space grants available. This year the Senate Interior Committee has acted favorably on my bills for a Redwood National Park and the San Rafael Wilderness near Santa Barbara. But more such measures are needed to create a viable environment for tomorrow's Californians.

Overpopulation, water and resource shortages, and an environment made unfit for human life by man's own intrusions on nature might discourage us from moving on to the twenty-first century, were it not for the other image—the image of technology as the good provider.

My profession is legislating, and I am happy to leave the technological speculation to the experts. In a recent study, Herman Kahn and Anthony Weiner listed one hundred innovations likely in the next thirty-three years, I read but a few:

"Lasers and masers for sensing, measuring, communicating, cutting, heating, welding, power transmission, illumination, destructive (defensive), and other purposes."

"New or improved super-performance fabrics (papers, fibers, and plastics)."

"More reliable and longer-range weather forecasting."

"New sources of power for ground transportation (storage-battery, fuel-cell propulsion or support by electromagnetic fields, jet engine, turbine)."

"Extensive and intensive world-wide use of high-altitude cameras for mapping, prospecting, census, land use, and geological investigations."

"Major reduction in hereditary and congenital defects."

"New or improved uses of the oceans (mining, extraction of minerals, controlled 'farming,' source of energy)."

"Three-dimensional photography, illustrations, movies, and television."

"Some control of weather or climate."

"Human hibernation for relatively extensive periods (months to years)."

"Capability to choose the sex of unborn children."

"General and substantial increase in life expectancy, postponement of aging, and limited rejuvenation."

"Permanent manned satellite and lunar installations—interplanetary travel."

"Permanent inhabited undersea installations and perhaps even colonies."

"Practical large-scale desalinization."

These things will not come about without the expenditure of money on basic research and development, and the federal government has moved boldly in the expenditure of research and development funds over the last two decades. In 1940 the federal government spent only \$74 million in basic research and development. By 1966 that had multiplied two hundred times over to an expenditure in excess of \$15 billion. Incidentally, over one-third of the total federal research and development dollar is spent in California. No state will play a greater role in shaping the technological future of this nation than the state we are honored to call our home.

The future holds dangers, but it also holds limitless promise. The first order of business is, I believe, a long, hard and thorough look at the federal executive effort to understand and cope with man's environment. The ad hoc creation of federal environmental programs has resulted in a crazy patchwork quilt, full of duplication and full of holes.

I count at least eighteen federal agencies having responsibility in the area of man's environment. There are seven agencies dealing with air pollution problems alone:

Environmental Science Services Administration, Environmental Health Services Centers, the Bureau of Mines, the Solid Waste Office, the Air Pollution Control Division, the Atomic Energy Commission, and, of all things, the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In water pollution, the agencies abound. Thirteen have responsibility in the area:

Environmental Science Services Administration, Environmental Health Sciences Center, the Water Pollution Control Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Mines, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Agricultural Research Service, and TVA.

An executive reorganization to bring some semblance of rationality and order to these frenetic, unguided and competitive efforts should be given top priority. Both political parties ought to make a pledge that it will be done.

If we delay too long, it will be more difficult to achieve earthbound institutional reform than to place a man on the moon. We will pay dearly if we do not face the need for fundamental reorganization of the federal effort in environmental control. The price we pay will be the continued degradation of man's surroundings.

Simultaneously, we should take a new look at the structure and organization of local governments. Local government in California has a distinguished history. In areas of education, health and labor legislation, California has provided a model for the nation.

But, in most of our metropolitan areas, government is frozen in outmoded patterns. The metropolis is one housing market, one transportation grid, one labor market. It is covered by one sky. But the core city represents only a minority of the total population. As population growth has spilled over into the suburbs, environmental problems which transcend the historical political boundaries have become unmanageable.

Efforts to bring about reform lie on your shoulders. It is a difficult task, for the existing local governmental structure is built on many sound reasons and a century of history. Reform will not come overnight, but it must be pursued in all areas where population sprawl has outrun the boundaries of the original core city. If the challenge is not met, I fear that the federal government will step into the void and force federal solutions to many essentially local problems.

There must be an increased emphasis in government at all levels, and in the private sector, on domestic utilization of technology developed for military or space applications.

Our research today is primarily devoted to improving our defense and space capability. The technological innovations derived in work on weapons and space research might remain an unlocked treasure, unless we pursue systematic and energetic efforts to turn them to the benefit of all mankind.

This is especially important in California. Within the past decade a decline in aircraft manufacturing grievously damaged one of our large southern counties. Between 1958 and 1965, aerospace employment there dropped from 80 per cent to 64 per cent of the area's total manufacturing employment.

Space related activities at Vandenberg Air Force Base, on the other hand, have increased. During the same period, the proportion of manufacturing employment in the Santa Barbara area involved in the aerospace industry rose from 30 per cent to 60 per cent. The vagaries of defense and aerospace contracts, and their adverse impact on the economy, would be considerably lightened by successful efforts to turn technology to beneficial domestic uses. An idea turned to domestic use can sustain employment while defense contracts come and go.

Finally, programs which promise to benefit people should be emphasized. In my view, two federal programs deserve the highest priority. The first, a cooperative program of NASA and the Interior, Agriculture and Navy Departments involves earth resource surveys from space. The other is the desalinization of the waters of the ocean.

By using remote sensing devices, such as cameras, radar, and other instrumentation, in airplanes and ultimately in orbiting satellites, vast quantities of new information for the good of mankind can be derived. A satellite circling the globe can inventory crop species, locate insect and disease infestation and pinpoint storms and fires. It can tell the density of snow-pack in the mountains, and is able to predict floods and water supply.

Space photography can be used by cartographers to map the surface of the earth and the bottom of the ocean with greater precision than has ever been possible before. From space, geologists can discover features of the earth's surface never before detectable. Instruments in the satellite can pinpoint water pollution, petroleum, minerals and subsurface water.

The information available from satellites will revolutionize the fishing industry. Wherever they may be in the oceans, large schools of fish will be detectable. Volcanic eruptions can even be predicted.

With the vast and seemingly limitless potential of this program, it is, nonetheless, a poor stepchild of our nation's space efforts. Despite the huge NASA budget, the earth resources project has never been adequately funded. The potential of an earth resources satellite is so great that it should no longer be shunted aside. While we are

putting a man on the moon and sending spacecraft far beyond into outer space, NASA ought also to utilize what we have already learned to unlock some of the unknown potential of the earth on which we live.

Desalinization of sea water is another program which must be pursued aggressively. I have been privileged to co-sponsor every piece of legislation on desalinization which has passed through the Senate in my years in that body. Just this year, my bill to authorize federal participation in a massive desalinization project off the coast of my home County of Orange was enacted.

In this effort, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which has one-half the population of our state within its service area, has joined a unique partnership of local, private and public utilities, and the federal government to build the world's largest sea water conversion plant. The plant will be built on a man-made 43-acre island and will produce 160 million gallons of fresh water each day, enough to supply the domestic needs of a city the size of San Francisco, and 1,800 megawatts of power, enough to supply the domestic needs of two million people.

This summer, former President Eisenhower and his Atomic Energy Commission Chairman, Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, proposed a daring new approach to bring water to the Middle East. The Eisenhower proposal would locate three massive dual-purpose nuclear powered desalting and electric power generating plants in the Middle East. Two plants would be located on the Mediterranean coast of Israel, the other at the northern end of the Gulf of Aqaba in Jordan or Israel.

The first stage of the bold Eisenhower proposal will be a 450 million gallon per day plant three times the size of the recently authorized California plant. This first plant would produce electric power far in excess of the present needs of the Middle Eastern deserts, but industry and prosperity would quickly follow the availability of abundant water and power.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has pending before it a resolution to put the Eisenhower plan into action. It was introduced by Senator Baker of Tennessee and co-sponsored by dozens of Senators, including myself.

The ability to talk seriously about the possibility of economically feasible large-scale desalinization is based on fifteen years of federal research. But we have not arrived. We merely are at a point where we predict that substantial quantities of fresh water can be produced cheaply enough to be used for municipal purposes. We have not yet produced large amounts of cheap desalted water. Aggressive support of the federal desalting program now is vital to peace and well-being of the world in the year 2000.

Soon it will be too late to cope with the choking and crowding that is becoming our very environment. Indeed, for those who have died from polluted air and contaminated water, it is already too late. We have to get out ahead of our technology, or technology and the debris it leaves behind will reduce mankind to a pitiful nothingness. We must create new human institutions to cope with our environment. We must make better use of the institutions we have. Failing that, we leave a sorry legacy for the coming twenty-first century.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO MODIFY THE OPERATION OF THE EXPEDITING ACT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Expediting Act,¹ designed to speed the deter-

¹ Act of Feb. 11, 1903, ch. 544, § 1, 32 Stat. 823, as amended; 15 U.S.C. §§ 28, 29; 49 U.S.C. §§ 44, 45.